This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

600004917R

27. 539.

600004917R

27. 539.

600004917R

27. 539.

AN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

WRITINGS

OF THE

NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

DR. JOHN LEONARD HUG,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF FREYBURGH, IN BREISGAU, &c.

TRANSLATED FROM THE ORIGINAL GERMAN,

BY THE

REV. DANIEL GUILDFORD WAIT, LL.D.

RECTOR OF BLAGDON, SOMERSETSHIRE,

MEMBER OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, AND OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. & J. RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, AND WATERLOO-PLACE, PALL-MALL.

1827.

539.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

AN

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

WRITINGS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PART II.

OR AN INTRODUCTION INTO THE WRITINGS, SEPARATELY.

CHAPTER I.

ON

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECTION I.

We find in the antient records a twofold order, in which the Evangelists are arranged. They stand either thus;—Matthew, John, Luke, Mark;—or thus, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John.—The first is made with reference to the character and the rank of the persons, according to which the Apostles precede their assistants and attendants (ἀκολουθοις, comitibus.) It is observed in the oldest Latin translations [a] and in the Gothic; sometimes also in the works of Latin teachers [b]; but among all the Greek MSS. only in that at Cambridge. But the other, namely, Matthew,

[a] Codd: Brix. Veronens. Vercellens. and partly Vindobonens.

[b] Tertullian. l. iv. adv. Marcion. c. 2. Denique nobis fidem ex *apostolis* Johannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex *apostolicis* Lucas et Marcus instaurant.

Mark, Luke and John is in all the old translations of Asia and Africa, in all catalogues of the canonical books, and in Greek MSS., in general, the customary and established one as it regarded not personal circumstances, but had respect to chronological, is to us a plain indication what accounts concerning the succession of the Evangelists the Asiatic and Greek churches and also those of Africa, had before them, when the Christian books were arranged in collections[c].

A repetition of these (though they have descended to us in a mutilated form) is still in Epiphanius[d], as well as in Eusebius's history of the church[e] and Chronicon. In the main point, if not in all the details, Eusebius agrees with the Cyprian bishop. It would therefore be indifferent to us which of the two we adopt, but let us give the preference to the father of Church History. The latter after having for a long time spoken of some extraneous accounts of John concurs in his own words, "We may now also make mention of his uncontradicted writings. Here we must first of all admit the authenticity of the Gospel, which is acknowledged by all churches under heaven: and that it was certainly correctly placed, by the antients, in the fourth place, after the other three, is evident from the following;....

[c] The Acts of the Apostles by Luke are the δευτερος λογος, the second part of the Gospel,—see below, Sect. 71. Both writings therefore as belonging to each other should have been united. This might easily have been done if it could have been agreed upon to place the Gospel of Luke after that of John; but in this point they acted rather arbitrarily and separated the two parts, by permitting an order contrary to history to take place in the arrangement of the Evangelists.

[d] Epiphan. Hær. li. beginning at the words; ἡ γαρ πασα των ευαγγελιων ὑποθεσις ουτως ἐχει.

[e] Euseb. H. E. liii. c. 24.

Matthew, who at the first taught among the Jews, published his Gospel in his native language when he was going to visit others, in order that, by his written instructions, he might make amends for his absence to those from whom he departed[f]." When Mark and Luke had also published their Gospels ...., and these three had fallen into the hands of many as well as into his, he gave his approbation and testimony to their "veracity: .... but something was defective in them .... on which account John, as it is said, being requested, included in his Gospel that space of time, which the rest had omitted, and those parts of the history of our Saviour, which occurred in it."

But long before these two Origen, a learned Biblical critic, had declared, that Matthew was the oldest historical Christian writer; Mark, the second; Luke, the third; and John, the last of them[g].

Farther back in the second century, Irenæus represents this same chronological succession of the Evangelists as a matter about which there was no uncertainty or difference of opinion[h].

The Latins, although in their copies they did not adopt as their own the chronological order, assigning to the Apostles the first rank, and to their scholars the second, nevertheless did not forget on that account the order of time, in which they succeeded each other. Jerome maintains all along, that Mat-

[f] It should perhaps be read ἀφ' ὧν διεστελλετο.

[g] Euseb. H. E. vi. 25. compare likewise Origen. Homil. vii. in Josuam. Tom. ii. Opp. Ruæi, p. 412. Sacerdotali tubâ primus in Evangelio suo Matthæus increpuit; Marcus quoque, &c. comment. in Jo. T. vi. p. 132. Opp. Vol. iv. ἀρξαμενος ἀπο του Ματθαιου, ὁς και παραδιδοται πρωτος των λοιπων τοις Ἑβραιοις ἐκδεδωκεναι το εὐαγγελιον, τοις ἐκ περιτομης πιστευουσι.

[h] Iren. Lib. iii. adv. Hæres. c. i. Euseb. H. E. V. 8.

thew wrote first; then Mark; then Luke; and last of all John. Augustine maintains the same [i].

The narrative in the celebrated Fragments preserved by Muratori exceeds the days of both these teachers by more than a century. According to him Luke was the third, and the disciple of the Lord the last, who published his Gospel: of the two first, accident has destroyed his account [k].

Whatever degree of difference may exist in the accessory circumstances, with which the several authors may invest the fact, and however different may be the sources from which they have derived their accounts, yet they all agree in this chronological order of the Evangelists, and assert unanimously the correctness of the succession, in which they are placed.

One only must be excepted; viz. Clemens Alexandrinus, who maintains that those Gospels, which contain the genealogies, were written first [l]. This assumption does not call in question Matthew's first rank; but at all events it assigns to Mark merely the third place among the Evangelists.

He refers also for this communication to authorities which he names, against the credibility of which I can only observe that Origen, his pupil, and in general all the church-teachers after him, conceived those sources which they followed to be so indubitable, that not one of them concurred in the opinion of Clemens; moreover the historian from whom we receive this information, did not for a moment waver in his conviction in consequence of it. We may thence infer how surely and confidently the antients

[i] Augustin de consensû Evangelist. L. i. § 3.

[k] Antiqq. Ital. medii ævi. T. iii. p. 854.

[l] προγεγραφθαι ἐλεγετο των εὐαγγελιων τα περιεχοντα τας γενεαλογιας, Euseb. H. E. vi. 14.

thought themselves informed concerning that chronological order of the Evangelists, in which moreover they all agreed.

At the least estimate these informations and assertions of the old Christian school have the validity of a stable hypothesis, and impose a caution how we depart from them in our investigations; yet, trusting that they confirm themselves, we resolve to put them aside if they entangle us in considerable difficulties or mislead us to absurd views upon the matter.

SECTION II.

Among the four biographies of Jesus, history declares that of Matthew to be the first and the oldest. It is however so contradictory as to the exact time at which his work was composed, and also as to certain questions belonging to this point, in its depositions, that we, far from hoping an explanation from it, must consign its whole investigation to the jurisdiction of higher critics. The conclusions which we draw from the manner in which the author proceeds to the nearest objects which he had in view, and from the circumstances passing before him at the time in which he wrote, are in this case more valid than the voices of either party, into which the accounts of antiquity are divided.

The scene of the events is Judæa, the acting personages for the most part are born in that country, the circle of ideas, the religious and secular circumstances are Jewish, peculiar and strange to the generality of the then existing nations.

Mark who, as well as Matthew, employed himself upon this history, finds himself frequently necessi-

tated, in consideration of his neighbouring readers, to explain, by observations, certain peculiarities in Jewish customs and opinions. The Pharisees, as he said, complained, that the disciples of Jesus ate κοιναις χερσιν—that is, literally, with common hands. In the supposition that his readers might not be acquainted with the Hebrew signification of the expression, he has added the explanation, that is to say, with unwashed hands, τουτ' ἐστιν ἀνιπτοις. Still fearing that they could not thoroughly understand the ground of this complaint and the explanation of it, he clears up the matter by an observation on the customs and opinions of the Pharisees, and states that these never eat but with washed hands, imagining that they would otherwise be defiled. He explains what is called παρασκευη by the Jews, that is the Fore-Sabbath, τουτ' ἐστιν προσαββατον, and what κορβαν means, as Josephus did for his Roman readers.

Matthew recounts the same, even in the same expressions, and speaks of these and many other similar matters; but he abstains from every addition and observation for the instruction of his readers, supposing all this to be already known to them.

Luke makes numerous observations of a geographical nature in order that his Theophilus, to whom the work was addressed, might briefly be instructed as much as possible concerning the place which was the scene of such an event.

Matthew does not pursue a similar course. Finding it superfluous to make any observations for the purpose of throwing light upon the morals, customs, opinions, and mode of thinking, all of which might be proper, as to Palestine, he also conducts himself in the same manner with regard to the geography, and is unmindful that his narrations might be unintelli-

gible and obscure to any person who was not acquainted with the country, neighbourhood, cities, &c.

In the twenty-second chapter, indeed, he attempts to assist the reader properly to understand the objection of the Sadducees by calling to his recollection that they deny the Resurrection; οἱ λεγοντες μη ειναι ἀναστασιν; but this explanation was in itself necessary for many of his countrymen, as the opinions of this school were beloved by the rich and more powerful, whose free mode of living they favoured, but were not yet, as Josephus states, introduced among the people [m].

He might, perhaps, have pursued that method either with the view of instructing his countrymen by his writings, or because he had not had the opportunity to observe by travelling, as Mark and Luke had, the customs of different nations and their dissimilarity from the Jewish manners and opinions; —the result however is the same, and we see by the manner of the author that Palestine was his historical boundary, and that the Jews of that country, or such as often came thither and were acquainted with its manners, peculiarities, and customs, were uppermost in his mind, and were those to whom his representations and historical details were directed.

SECTION III.

If we now also observe the PRACTICAL SCOPE of his history, and the reflections which he makes upon the actions of Jesus, the aim and intention with

[m] Jos. Ant. L. xviii. c. 1. § 4.

which he wrote, will be discovered. He has for instance more than once given us an opportunity of comprehending what, in his opinion, would be particularly instructive to the reader. As long as the author recounts events, he does not anticipate our judgment: but as soon as he begins to make observations upon those events, he ceases to be a mere relater of facts, and leads us back into his own opinions, and into his aim and intention in which he wishes us to participate.

All the reflections of Matthew are of one sort. He shews us in all, that what Jesus did and taught was characteristic of the Messiah. In remarkable incidents, or in portions of doctrinal discourses he carries us back into the ancient holy books of the Jews, in which the image of the coming Saviour is pourtrayed, and shews feature by feature that the great Ideal, which flitted before the Prophets, is seen realized in Jesus. This idea he carries throughout the whole of his narration, whereas Luke and Mark seldom adduce passages from the Old Testament, and when they do, it is for the most part only in cases where they are in the mouth of some person acting and speaking in the history, in which instance they are relations of what others said and not quotations of the historians themselves. Without taking into the account the passages, Matt. i. 23.; ii. 6., 15., 18., these (viz. iii. 3., iv. 14., viii. 17., xii. 17., xiii. 35., xxi. 4., xxvi. 56., xxvii. 9.,) are always introduced with the words ὁπως, or, ἱνα πληρωθῃ το ῥηθεν, and maintained to be fulfilments of the Old Testament, which considered together in their connection and situation leave no doubt whatever as to the principal views of the author.

This book therefore deserved to be called, εὐαγ-

γελιον, the consolatory annunciation of the Messiah; —an appellation which, in the sequel, was attached to all the other biographies of Jesus, though their peculiar aim was entirely different from that of Matthew.

SECTION IV.

If it was the principal motive of the author to shew that Jesus was the Messiah, it was less consistent with his plan to give a circumstantial and chronologically-arranged history, which should point out all the particulars, and detail minutely, even the incidental matters, than to bring together, in a general manner, all the events at one glance, from which the dignity of his person and his character became evident, and to compose from a selection of actions, a striking image, which did not stand in need of being perfected by the relation of matters of a secondary nature.

In this manner has Matthew proceeded. At the commencement of the ministry of Jesus he has collected in one view the main points of his doctrine out of many discourses, and united them in the celebrated Sermon on the Mount, which, as is already allowed, consists of several instructions given at different times. In a similar manner he has thrown together, in one collection[n], the Parables of Jesus, however different may have been the time and place at which they were delivered, which formed a proof that Jesus also, in his mode of teaching answered to the description of the promised Saviour,—the method

[n] Chap. xiii. xiv.

of teaching by Parables having been predicted by the Prophets to be peculiar to the Messiah, xiii. 35. From the end, therefore, which the author had in view, we have less to expect a biography arranged in chronological order, than a sketch of his character and of the object of the sublime teacher, in which, the facts put together for this particular purpose (and only so far as was requisite to it) are detailed. We could (since the Platonic teacher, Justin the Martyr, calls the Gospels in general ἀπομνημονευματα), compare this book of Matthew with Xenophon's Memorabilia of Socrates, to which, in plan and arrangement, it has a resemblance, that cannot be mistaken.

SECTION V.

According to some hints which are scattered throughout the book, a long time elapsed between the events and the time of its composition. Matthew twice confirms the fact, that from the time at which certain circumstances took place, until he appeared as an author, traces of those circumstances were still extant in the country, and expresses himself on these occasions as one would do in speaking of things which had happened some time since, xxvii. 8., xxviii. 15.

At the judgment of Jesus he elucidates a circumstance, the recollection of which he must have supposed to be no longer sufficiently known. For, when Pilate proposes Jesus and Barabbas to the people, for them to release one of them, he adds the observation, that it had been customary, at the festival, for the prætor to set at liberty any prisoner

whom the people desired, xxvii. 15. A circumstance, which as a privilege partially founded on custom, could not so easily be forgotten *.

The passage in xxiii. 35. which mentions Zacharias, the son of Barachias being murdered between the temple and the altar, leads us to a nearer definition of the time. If we pay attention to the name, the fact, the circumstances and the object, with which Jesus mentions it, there is no doubt of it being Ζαχαριας Βαρουχου, who, according to Josephus' account, suffered unmerited death in the midst of the temple shortly before its destruction. The name agrees, the murderous deed and the remarkable circumstance, which distinguishes it, are the same, as well as the character of the man, το λιαν τ' ανδρος μισοπονηρον, his strict righteousness, and also this circumstance, that he, like the wise-men and the Prophets, still told the Jews the truth intrepidly. When Jesus farther says, that all innocently shed blood from Abel down to Zacharias shall be revenged on the Jews, this απο and εως in like manner express a beginning and an end, both of which are put instead of all the circumstances, which happened in the interim. Thus Zacharias is made the limit,—is mentioned as the last, before this revenge shall commence; the threatened revenge, however, is, that Jerusalem shall be abandoned to destruction and become desolate, xxiii. 37, 38. Who can it then be but this very Zacharias, whose death history distinguishes among so many murders, as the only still remaining acknowledged righteous

* This and the following observations from which I venture to infer something respecting the time when the work was composed, have for some time obtained the approbation of a distinguished scholar. Vide Eichhorn Introd. to N. T. Part I. p. 507.

person, after the death of the High Priest Ananias, before the destruction of the Holy City?

We are not here to think of the Zacharias mentioned in 2 Chron. xxiv. 23. He is the son of Jehoiada, who was not killed between the temple and the altar, or ἐν μεσῳ τῳ ναῳ, but in the Fore-Court, and is not the person who terminates the number of the innocently slain, or who concludes an epoch in the annals of the Jews. Was there not, from the days of King Joas in which this happened, any other righteous person among them murdered? or shall not the others be revenged? Had there already been, at that time, a punishment fully inflicted for all the innocently shed blood? Is there *in that place*, a particular point in history, which is signalized as a great and general time of punishment for the Jewish nation?

But it is quite evident, that this Zacharias is represented by Jesus as a person yet to come. He says: I send unto you wise-men and Prophets whom you will scourge, kill and persecute, μαστιγωσετε, σταυρωσετε, διωξετε, that the punishment of all innocent blood may come upon you from Abel unto Zacharias. Here Zacharias terminates the number of the ill-used righteous, whom the Jews would still abuse, scourge, and crucify, and for whose blood they would have to answer.

It is therefore this Zacharias of whom Josephus, Bell. Jud. iv. c. 6. n. 4., has written, whose death followed long after Jesus, but of whom the Lord, in a prophetical spirit, spoke. Matthew, who relates to us the discourse of Jesus, makes him speak throughout the whole prophetic passage in the future tense, and of Zacharias himself as a person who is yet to suffer: but when he comes to the

commission of the murder, he cannot conceal that it is known to him as having already taken place, and instead of putting, as he should have done, the main fact in the Lord's mouth, in the future tense, he recounts it in plain words as a past transaction, and says: ὁν ἐφονευσατε μεταξυ κ. τ. λ. whom you *have* murdered between the temple and the altar.

The event happened some time after the conquest of Gamala, which took place in the month Hyperberetæus, or our October. After which Josephus enumerates to us one more spring and winter, then a summer, in which, the death of Nero followed. Here then we have the time of the fact, which rested in the mind of the author, when he composed his work, and was mentioned therein as a matter that had taken place.

A similar hint which is thrown out in his work refers us to the same epoch. In a discourse concerning the destruction of the temple and the end of the Jewish kingdom, chap. xxiv., Jesus points out to his disciples the signs of this approaching period, and he distinguishes one in particular respecting the temple, which, when perceived, should be a signal for flight. When (he says) you see the βδελυγμα της ἐρημωσεως standing in the holy place, then flee. History has only preserved to us two facts which happened in the temple before its entire destruction, to which these expressions are appropriated, and which on account of their near relation to the destruction of this magnificent edifice, and of the whole state, are to be considered as forerunners and causes of the desolation and of the overthrow, of which (two facts) however, the second is a consequence of the first. The wildest among the zealots, namely, the strolling robbers, who had assumed the name of Zealots for their

country, possessed themselves of the temple, converted the sanctuary into a place of arms, and into the seat of their murder and tyranny. The High Priest Ananias, who still entertained hopes of an accommodation with the Romans, attempted to drive the zealots from the temple, but in vain. From that time they remained the predominant party, turned the temple into a fortification, and made it the centre of the war, from which they guided the fate of Jerusalem and maintained themselves therein against the Romans until the conflagration of the temple itself.

Here we have a sanctuary defiled by hideous crimes, and destructive abominations in the midst of it: Josephus also found them there, and saw from thence the prognostic of the inevitable destruction of the whole state, according to the prediction of the Prophets [p].

They had not long had possession of the temple, when, to assure themselves of it, and of the mastery of the peaceably disposed, they called to their assistance the Idumeans, an heathen nation, who not only profaned the temple by their polluted presence, but also committed therein a horrible massacre, so that the exterior of the building was inundated with blood.

Whichever of the two facts, if we may consider them as two, we look upon, as the βδελυγμα της ἐρημωσεως, it is not essential to the point which we have in view. They are certainly the only facts,

[p] Bell. Jud. l. iv. c. 6. n. 3. ἐγελατο τε τα θεια, και τους των προφητων θεσμους, ὡσπερ ἀγυρτικας λογοποιϊας ἐχλευαζον· πολλα δε οὐτοι περι ἀρετης και κακιας προειθεσπισαν, ἁ παραβαντες οἱ ζηλωται, και την κατα της πατριδος προφητειαν τελους ἠξιωσαν. Ἠν γαρ δη και τις παλαιος λογος ἀνδρων ἐνθα ποτε την πολιν ἁλωσεσθαι, και καταφλεγησεσθαι τα ἁγια νομῳ, πολεμου, στασις ἐαν κατασκηψῃ, και χειρες οἰκειαι ΠΡΟΜΙΑΝΩΣΙ το του Θεου τεμενος κ. τ. λ.

which history characterizes as such, or rather they are the only remarkable events respecting the temple, which it adduces at all, previous to its entire destruction. They both occur immediately before the death of Zacharias.

Now, when Matthew recites the discourse of the Lord upon this circumstance, and has arrived at the words "abomination of desolation" in the temple, he suddenly interrupts the speech of Jesus with an apostrophe, and in the midst of our Lord's discourse exclaims to his readers: "if you should chance to see the abomination of desolation as spoken of by Daniel occurring in the holy place, *Whoso readeth let him understand,* then let the inhabitants of Judæa flee into the mountains."

Matthew must have found the reason for this exclamation in the state in which matters were at that time. As the passsage speaks of the signal for flight, and as he calls upon his readers not to let it pass unnoticed, it must needs have existed, and been evident; the warning of Jesus must have pointed at the circumstances of the time, and the signal, *The abomination of desolation in the sanctuary,* Το βδελυγμα της ἐρημωσεως ἑστως ἐν τοπῳ ἁγιῳ, must have forcibly operated upon his mind.

Such were the circumstances of the time, when Matthew was composing the last chapters of his book; for this passage was not written later. The Romans had already possession of Galilee, when these scenes occurred in Jerusalem and were upon the point of making a conquest of Judea; had they been already in possession of it, at that time, the warning to the inhabitants of Judea to avail themselves of the signal for flight would then have been useless.

SECTION VI.

These circumstances principally led him to his undertaking and to the plan of his work. There was, both before and during the civil disturbances of the Jews, as Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius assure us, a report circulated, that the time was not far distant when their Saviour and the restorer of their independence, viz. the Messiah, would appear. This belief, according to the above-mentioned authors, contributed in no inconsiderable degree to strengthen their resolution of commencing the war and of carrying it on with obstinacy.

The insurrection begun against the Romans, drew the whole nation together into one central point of union and one common interest: all again became Jewish with a fanatical enthusiasm, whereby Christianity must have lost no small number of its professors.

Under such opinions and circumstances Matthew wrote his sketch of the actions, instructions, and miracles of Jesus, with reference to the ancient holy books, in which the lineaments of the picture of the Messiah were confessedly scattered. He proved that he had already appeared, that Jesus of Nazareth was he, that his life and actions were pointedly consistent with the representations of the Prophets.—By this, the deceptions and the hopes which the Insurgents had raised, and the main ground upon which they had gained the public opinion, were most sensibly attacked.

This book, in which the destruction of the religious and civil constitution, of the temple and of the Holy city were predicted by Jesus, might be instructive to many, however little the present endeavours might be successful, and however more advan-

tageous it might be to remain faithful to the quietly suffering school of Jesus.

It promised also, after the destruction of the temple, and the cessation of all the externals of the Jewish worship festivals and sacrifices, that a considerable part of the surviving Jews should embrace Christianity, and that after the fulfilment of these events, the occurrence of which was announced by Jesus so early in this work, they should acknowledge him as the Teacher and King Messiah who had established a kingdom of virtue and truth for the children of Israel.

This work was designed to preserve those who are already scholars of Christianity in their faith, and prepare the way for the future conversion of the Jews to it.

SECTION VII.

And thus it happened. The new doctrine had many professors among the Jews, who remained faithful to it, and it gained many more after the destruction, who, however, in Palestine, as well as every where would abandon no part of Judaism, but would unite it with the religion of the Messiah. But, they varied in their opinions, and on account of them divided themselves into two leading sects, known by the name of Nazoræans and Ebionites.

The Ebionites particularly distinguished themselves by a passionate adherence to the Law and Judaism, and by some peculiar dogmas respecting the divine origin of Jesus. They had, instead of all the religious books of the Christians, a single historical book only of the actions of Jesus, which

they named κατα Ματθαιον [q], which being composed in the Hebrew language, was also called εὐαγγελιον καθ' Ἑβραιους [r].

The Nazoræans, likewise, who were acquainted with the Hebrew language (in which they afterwards still continued to read the holy books of their nation,) preserved the ancient reverence for the religion of their fathers, and possessed as a summary of the Christian faith, a Hebrew work also, which we find called by the title το καθ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιον, although seldom by the title κατα Ματθαιον, —which, as a book relative to the Messiah, may be considered as a supplement to their Jewish canon.

From these circumstances arises the question; Did not Matthew perhaps write his Gospel originally in the Hebrew language?

SECTION VIII.

The account which assures us of this, proceeds likewise from another quarter, namely, from orthodox teachers. Papias says: Matthew wrote his history in the Hebrew language [s]. This testimony, indeed, loses a great deal of its weight from the observation of Eusebius, through whom it has descended to us, who says that this teacher was very simple, πανυ σμικρος τον νουν. Eusebius, who was still in possession of his writings, could certainly form a more correct opinion respecting them, than

[q] Irenæus, L. i. adv. Hær. C. 26. L. iii. C. ii.

[r] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. C. 27. Epiphan. Hæres. xxx.

[s] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. C. 39. περι δε Ματθαιου ταυτα εἰρηται. Ματθαιος μεν οὐν ἑβραϊδι διαλεκτῳ τα λογια συνεγραψατο.

we can: but since Papias has been taken under the protection of learned men, who for their purposes might have wished him a little more acute, we will gladly admit that he was only a little simple[1].

If we do not look upon the object of the investigation as a critical question, and if we consider his declaration not as his own account, but as one which was merely committed to paper by him, he might indeed be deserving of some attention, for, according to the remarks of the antients concerning him, he was an assiduous collector of verbal traditions, which formed afterwards the materials of his works.

But in case we be not previously satisfied as to a man's spirit of investigation, it depends entirely upon our being instructed respecting the sources to which his honest declarations refer, for us to be indemnified by his diligence and good will for his confined critical powers. These, which would be alone sufficient to confer credibility on his weak mental endowments, Papias has not here shewn.

Might he not probably then have derived his accounts of an *Hebrew* text of Matthew from the school of the Ebionites or Nazoræans? and of what worth would his assertion then be?

[1] The severe judgment of Eusebius is not founded, as Michaelis, in his Introduction to the N. T. part II. §. 133. 4th Edit. supposes, simply upon the circumstance of Papias believing a Millennium, and of understanding some parables too literally, but upon the general contents of his writings, in which he accepted as real, spurious parables and discourses of our Lord, and many other fabulous things, *και τινα αλλα μυθικωτερα*,—among which was the Chiliasmus. The narratives, which Eusebius has extracted from him, are not of a stamp to enable us to form an opinion of him, for he naturally collected from him for his history, not the most fabulous, but the most useful, and the most probable.

He certainly received direct or indirect information from this quarter, namely, with regard to the Gospel of the Hebrews, of which he has quoted a passage in his writings. He uses also, (such are the words of Eusebius, Hist. E. L. iii.,) testimonies from the first Epistle of John, and from the first Epistle of Peter, and dwells largely upon another history of a woman who was accused to our Lord on account of her manifold sins, which is contained in the Gospel of the Hebrews, ἣν το καθ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιον περιεχει.

What degree of confidence does the inquisitive historian now place upon a man who always proceeded on sayings and oral accounts, whose capacity of criticizing them was very limited, and whose sources, according to evident indications, in this particular case, are very suspicious?

The next, who advances these assertions to us, is Irenæus [u]. *Matthew*, says he, *published his Gospel among the Jews in their own language*. But Irenæus was not only so very well acquainted with the writings of Papias, that he may be suspected to have borrowed his account from that author, but he likewise entertained a high esteem for him, and mentions him with an eulogy so very great for Irenæus, that we not only thence find matter of suspicion, but a tolerably clear evidence that he, if he had not read these accounts in Papias, must at least have taken them to be entirely true. With regard to the matter there discussed, he speaks thus: "*This is asserted by Papias, who was a hearer of John, a cotemporary of Polycarp, and one of the antients, in the fourth book of his* ἐξηγησεων λογιων κυριακων."

The circumstance of his being an acquaintance and

[u] L. iii. adv. Hæres. C. 1. Euseb. H. E. L. v. C. 8.

cotemporary of Polycarp, for whom Irenæus had an unbounded esteem, would alone have been a sufficient inducement for Irenæus to accept his account with unlimited approbation. Let us now consider the above predicates collectively, that we may judge how far Irenæus is dependent upon Papias, and let us add, that he, in the same passage in which he heaps all these eulogiums upon Papias, founds his belief in the empire of a thousand years (or *Millennium*,) upon the opinion of this teacher, L. v. adv. Hær. C. 33.

In this very same work, which Irenæus here quotes and praises, was the account of the Hebrew text of Matthew, (whence Eusebius also derived it), so that there is no doubt whatever, that Irenæus himself had found and read this assertion of Papias in his works. H. E. L. iii. fin.

The third evidence is Origen in Euseb. Hist. E. L. vi. c. 25. This teacher had by far the best knowledge of language and of general matters, and from him we might expect a decision that would be founded on deep investigations, on account of the importance of the subject: he was peculiarly competent to decide the question. But the author through whom we receive his assertion respecting the Hebrew text of this Gospel, faithfully observes that the declaration of Origen is not the result of critical investigations, but that he referred to a tradition for his allegation; ὡς ἐν παραδοσει μαθων. Yet indeed παραδοσις there was a worthy title to credibility; for, it was an account of antient and respectable teachers. Such an one indeed was extant when Origen wrote, and we are acquainted with it. This was the Christian fathers and Judaizing Christians, who agreed in this particular, and formed one

common opinion which guided the judgment of Origen.

Eusebius himself is the last who yet deserves to be examined. Hist. E. L. iii. c. 24. This learned man asserts an original Hebrew text of Matthew: but he likewise opposes it. As a writer and compiler of History, where he makes his conclusions according to authorities, which he also, as we see, faithfully points out to us, he asserts it. But as a Philologist and Biblical investigator he forms a different opinion. In his commentary upon the Psalms, he observes, that Matthew as a man who was himself acquainted with the Hebrew language, had cited the words, φθεγξομαι προβληματα ἀπ' ἀρχης, Ps. lxxvii. according to his *own translation:* (we speak of the Greek expression of the LXX. from which Matthew departed for the sake of rendering the passage differently,) ἀντι του φθεγξομαι ἀπ' ἀρχης Ἑβραιος ὢν ὁ Ματθαιος οἰκειᾳ ἐκδοσει κεχρηται εἰπων· ἐκρευξομαι κεκρυμμενα. κ. τ. λ.

The whole historical deduction for a Hebrew copy of Matthew, if we trace back all the testimonies to their origin, rests upon the declaration of the Judaizing Christians, of whom the Ebionites were in possession of a book in their language which they called κατα Ματθαιον, and as each sect recommended it as the only, true, credible, and perfect book of Religion[x], (with which assertion the Nazoræans perhaps agreed also) they knew how to prepossess one or another of the Christian teachers in its favour; by means of whom the tradition obtained farther reputation and recommendation.

[x] Των δε λοιπων (εὐαγγελιων) σμικρον ἐποιουντο λογον. Euseb. H. E. L. iii. C. 27.

SECTION IX.

But might not also the Hebrew Christians say the truth and be deserving of credit? The Ebionites formed a numerous body among the professors of Christianity, therefore, and on account of their antiquity, they deserve our attention with respect to their assertions.

The more ancient records for instance fix their origin at a much earlier period than some of the later investigators of history. Irenæus, who, Lib. i. cap. 26. speaks of the Ebionites, mentions them after Cerinthus immediately before the Nicolaitans; but Eusebius has placed them after Menander, the scholar of Simon, before Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans. He has thereby kept in view the succession of time: for, after having discussed the Ebionites, he continues; "*About the same time,* κατα τους δεδηλουμενους χρονους, Cerinthus, another leader of the Heretics appeared: *lastly, with these also,* επι τουτων δητα, (so he says in the following paragraph), appeared the heresy of the Nicolaitans." Hist. E. L. iii. c. 26, 27, 28. Jerome mentions among the Heretics whom John opposes in his Gospel, the then rising sect of the Ebionites, *et maxim etunc Ebionitarum Dogma consurgens.* Catal. v. Jo. and Procem. in Matth.—Epiphanius says: according to the accounts which had descended to him the Ebionites seem to have sprung up at the period, when, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Christians settled themselves in Peræa, particularly in Pella and in the adjoining neighbourhood. Hær. xxx. In the time of Hadrian they already possessed distinguished persons among those of their own persuasion, viz. Theodotion and Aquilas, and probably,

indeed, among their opponents, Justin the Martyr, who, according to Theodoret, wrote against them. For his book, which he had written against the Heretics is older than his greater apology which refers to the same, and which was composed shortly after the second Jewish war, which he there calls τον νυν γενομενον πολεμον.

We are less certain of the age and origin of the Nazoræans: they were sometimes overlooked by the Hæresiologists either because they comprehended them among the first, or because they had a more favorable opinion of them.

Their book is, like the book of the Ebionites, no longer exant, but several fragments of it, which have been preserved, furnish us with matter for its examination. That we may then be able to judge of it, it is necessary to see, how far its existence may be retraced into antiquity, and how much of its contents may be discovered with certainty, lest we should decide, *a priori*, an historical question, which must be answered by documents.

The author who has written most extensively on this subject is Jerome. He obtained this book from the Nazoræans themselves, and translated it into the Greek and Latin languages, from whence this teacher's most intimate acquaintance with it is fully apparent, and he is to be regarded as a source in investigations relating to it. He himself guides us to its age, and affords some data for determining the time, when it originated. In particular, he informs us that Origen sometimes quoted it in his writings, of which we can even now be certified by a collation. Both of them, in their works which are yet extant, have appealed to the same passage of this Gospel; Jerome in the commentary upon Micah viii. 6. Qui ..... crediderit Evangelio, quod secun-

dum Hebræos editum nuper transtulimus, in quo de personâ Salvatoris dicitur; *modo tulit me Mater mea Spiritus Sanctus in uno capillorum meorum*, non dubitabit dicere sermonem Dei ortum esse de Spiritû, et animam quæ sponsa sermonis est, habere sacrum Sanctum Spiritum, qui apud Hebræos genere dicitur fœminino. Origen in the fifteenth Homily upon Jeremiah, and in the commentary upon John[y]: ἐαν δε προσιεται τις το καθ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιον, ἐνθα αὐτος ὁ σωτηρ φησιν, ἀρτι ἐλαβε με ἡ μητηρ μου το ἁγιον πνευμα, ἐν μιᾳ των τριχων μου και ἀπηνεγκε με εἰς το ὀρος το μεγα Θαβωρ. So far distinct traces of its existence are now shewn, which go back still farther to the teacher of Origen[z], if indeed the former entertained the same opinion as his scholar of το καθ' Ἑβραιους εὐαγγελιον. He communicates to us the following passage from it: ὁ θαυμασας βασιλευσει και ὁ βασιλευσας ἀναπαυθησεται.

There are still earlier notices of its higher antiquity which may be moulded into a regular proof. Ignatius the Martyr mentions in the epistle to the inhabitants of Smyrna some words of Jesus, which are not extant in our Gospels, but which, to judge from combination and connection, are taken out of a written document. They are to this effect: και ὁτε προς τους περι Πετρον ἠλθεν, ἐφη αὐτοις, λαβετε, ψηλαφησατε με και ἰδετε, ὁτι οὐκ εἰμι Δαιμονιων ἀσωματον, και εὐθυς αὐτου ἡψαντο και ἐπιστευσαν.

The Bishop of Antioch in Syria, from the situation of his residence, could, if a Gospel of the Hebrews had been in existence, have easily laid his hand

[y] Fabric. Cod. Apocryph. Nov. Test. P. i. p. 362. Edit. Hamb. 1719. We also find the passages belonging to it collected in the New Investigation of the Age and Credibility of the Gospel of the Hebrews, by M. Chr. Frederick Weber. Tübingen. 1806. 8.

[z] Clem. Alex. Lib. iii. Strom. C. 9.

upon it, and it would be very improper for him to have been ignorant of it. The words however really stood in the Hebrew Gospel, from which Jerome has in part taken them in the prologue to the eighteenth book upon Isaiah. Cum enim eum putarent Spiritum, vel juxta Evangelium, quod Hebraicum lectitant Nazareni, *incorporale* Dæmonium, dixit eis, quid turbati estis et cogitationes ascendunt in corda vestra? videte manus meas et pedes meos, &c. But he says most expressly, in his catalogue of the Christian authors, in Ignatius, that they were contained entire in this Jewish work: Scripsit et ad Smyrnæos, in quo et de Evangelio, quod nuper a me translatum est super personâ Christi ponit testimonium dicens. . . . *Et quando venit ad Petrum et ad eos, qui cum Petro erant, dixit eis: Ecce palpate me et videte, quia non sum Dæmonium incorporale, et statim tetigerunt eum et crediderunt.*

From these observations the book is very probably of a great antiquity, and the date of its existence was during the days of the Apostles or shortly afterwards. It was, according to the fragments, which are still extant in the works of the Latin father, not very like to Matthew and yet not altogether unlike to him.

Of however remote antiquity the existence of the Jewish book may be shewn to be, and attested by historical proofs, we nevertheless find it so different from our Matthew, that the identity of the two writings cannot be conjectured in any way from their contents. The testimonies of its existence in Origen and Clemens are so many proofs of the difference of the two, and Matthew has not at all employed himself upon that part of the history, which comprises the events subsequent to the resurrection, to which the passage cited by Ignatius belongs. It was consequently, if we judge of it even by the

oldest testimony, in the first period of its existence, and even in its plan, by no means corresponding to Matthew.

Yet, although this book, according to these data, which are the grounds of discerning its antiquity and contents, was a different work, still the epoch of its origin, which borders on the contemporaries of our Lord, ensures to it an historical value, the estimation of which, Origen, indeed, as often as he makes use of it, leaves to the judgment of his readers, but which the Martyr of Antioch, as far as this passage is concerned, accepts unconditionally. It was not indeed destitute of absurdities, as is shewn by the account of the Holy Ghost, which as the mother of Jesus carried the Son by a hair of his head up to Tabor; this however does not justify us in forming an estimation of the whole, but would well justify us in critically investigating the different parts of it if we were in possession of it. Some parts of it, which have been preserved, are indeed of such a nature, as not to be unworthy of our Lord, and might well have been spoken by him as a teacher. Jerome tells us, for instance, (Comment. in Ezech. xxiv. 7,) that for any man to sadden the mind of his brother is mentioned therein among the great crimes, and in another place, (Comment. ad Ephes. v. 4.) Our Lord says to his disciples: Never be in greater joy than when you see your brother happy. Two admonitions which are entirely conformable to the magnanimity of Christianity.

The Ebionites, who likewise possessed an Hebrew Gospel, had, (according to the account of Jerome, who, in Palestine was acquainted with the Hebrew language, and was in habits of intimacy and intercourse with the Nazoræans, and who might also have been so with these,) no other than the Nazorean,

which both parties used in common[a]. By this, the question respecting the age, value, and contents of the Ebionitical book would be solved, had not Epiphanius, who was of Palestine, brought up among the Jews, and acquainted with their language, produced to us extracts from the Gospel of the Ebionites, which make us distrustful of the account of Jerome. Among a few other fragments, he has extracted from it the history of the baptism of Jesus, Hæres. xxx., which the Latin Father of the church has inserted from the Nazoræan book into his commentary upon Isaiah iv. 12. The narrative of both compositions is so totally different, that we do not perceive in them even a trace of a former resemblance, as we may perceive from this example.

Factum est autem, cum ascendisset Dominus de aquâ, et fons omnis Spiritûs Sancti descendit et requievit super eum, et dixit illi ; fili, in omnibus prophetis expectabam te, ut venires et requiescerem super te, tu es enim requies mea, tu es filius meus primogenitus, qui regnas in sempiternum.

Τουτε λαου βαπτισθεντος ηλθε Ιησους και εβαπτισθη υπο του Ιωαννου· και ως ανηλθεν εκ του υδατος, ηνοιγησαν οι ουρανοι, και ειδε το πνευμα του Θεου το αγιον εν ειδει περιστερας κατελθουσης εις αυτον, και φωνη εγενετο εκ του ουρανου λεγουσα· συ μου ει ο υιος ο αγαπητος, εν σοι ευδοκησα· εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε· και ευθυς περιελαμψε τον τοπον φως μεγα, ο ιδων ο Ιωαννης λεγει αυτω· συ τις ει κυριε; και παλιν φωνη εξ ουρανου προς αυτον·

[a] In Evangelio, quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitæ, quod nuper in Græcum de Hebræo sermone transtulimus. Comment. in Matth. xii. 13.

οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ υἱος μου ὁ ἀγαπητος, ἐφ' ὁν εὐδοκησα. Και τοτε Ἰωαννης προσπεσων αὐτῳ λεγει· δεομαι σου κυριε, συ με βαπτισον· ὁ δε ἐκωλυεν αὐτῳ, ἀφης, ὁτι οὑτως ἐστι πρεπον πληρωθηναι παντα.

It has been supposed, out of respect to the testimony of the Latin father, which he deposes concerning a matter about which, he was most circumstantially informed, that Epiphanius, who, in the account of the Ebionitish dogmata, (as he himself says,) discussed, at the same time, the opinions of the Elksaites or Sampsæans, by mistake mixed and confounded the tenets and the religious books of the one party with those of the other[b]. But he was far too well informed, as to the writings of this branch of the Jewish school, of which he gives an account in the treatise on the Oszæans and Sampsæans, and his conduct in analyzing the Ebionitical opinions declares the contrary. He has indeed united these Jewish sects together, on account of the similarity of their principles, yet (he has done so) with a proper regard to the doctrines which distinguished them. In representing some opinions peculiar to the Sampsæans, he adds at the same time, that they differ in these from the Ebionites: ἠδη δε μοι και ἀνωτερω προδεδηλωται, ὡς ταυτα μεν Ἐβιων οὐκ ἠδει. A little afterwards, he again distinguishes the opinions of the older Ebionitical school from those which their subsequent disciples defended: τοτε μεν αὐτος Ἐβιων λεγων ἐκ παρατριβης ψιλον ἀνθρωπον

[b] Storr on the object of the Gospel history and on the Epistles of John, § 28. § 61.

γεγενησθαι· ἀλλοτε δε οἱ ἀπ' αὐτου Ἐβιοναιοι. From this conduct we have no reason to fear that we shall be led astray through a confusion of the subjects.

It is therefore the Ebionitical book, from which he has taken these extracts; and however unlike it is to the Nazoræan cited by Jerome, yet the Cyprian bishop seems to agree with the account of the Latin father. He speaks of both writings under the same appellations, κατα Ματθαιον and εὐαγγελιον Ἑβραϊκον·— he seems to deduce them from Matthew, and only to attribute their difference to the interpolations, omissions, and additions to which they were exposed, and to arrange them into the πληρεστατον and οὐ πληρεστατὸν και νενοθευμενον [c], whence also he did not know, whether the Nazoræans had preserved or rejected the genealogy.

The following reason also for a former identity may likewise be worthy of consideration. Jerome joins also to the Nazoræan Gospel the appellation secundum Apostolos. In Evangelio .... quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni, secundum Apostolos, sive, ut plerique autumant, juxta Matthæum. Lib. iii. adv. Pelag., by which the contents are not only referred to Matthew but to all the Apostles, which also agrees with the writings of the Ebionites. There, in the very beginning, they are all represented as speaking of themselves in the first person: *There was a man, whose name was Jesus, who when he became thirty years old, chose us.* And then follow,

[c] Hæres. xxix. de Nazoræis. ἐχουσι δε το κατα Ματθαιον εὐαγγελιον πληρεστατον Ἑβραϊστι· παρ' αὐτοις γαρ σαφως τουτο, καθως ἐξ ἀρχης ἐγραφη, Ἑβραϊκοις γραμμασιν ἐτι σωζεται. Hær. xxx. de Ebione. και δεχονται μεν και αὐτοι το κατα Ματθαιον εὐαγγελιον .... καλουσι δε αὐτο καθ' Ἑβραιους, ὡς τα ἀληθη ἐστιν εἰπειν, ὁτι Ματθαιος μονος Ἑβραϊστι· κ. τ. λ. ἐν τῳ γουν παρ' αὐτοις εὐαγγελιῳ, κατα Ματθαιον ὀνομαζομενῳ, οὐχ ὁλῳ δε πληρεστατῳ, which indeed is not entire but very copious, ἀλλα νενοθευμενῳ, και ἠκροτηριασμενῳ. λ.

in the address of Jesus, the names of the twelve, among whom our Lord says to Matthew in particular; *And also thee, Matthew, have I called as thou sattest at the receipt of customs*[d].

Since in the beginning, all the Apostles are thus speaking of themselves, they shew that they are all participants in the contents, and this Gospel is, properly speaking, a writing *secundum Apostolos*, like that of the Nazoræans, in which, as Jesus, in his address, particularly distinguishes Matthew, he had a principal part, and perhaps the merit of editor.

But, be that as it may, whether it was one, or two originally different writings, neither of the two cases leads to a very flattering result with respect to the pure and honest declaration on their part, which is indispensable to the historical credibility. Supposing that this difference originated in arbitrary alterations by the two sects, which have obliterated the original similarity and its traces, contrary to the custom of the Jews, with whom it was accounted criminal and sinful to venture such an act in an acknowledged holy book, can we, in that case, ascribe a declaration, that will be considered valid before the tribunal of critics, to these men, who act thus towards a religious book for the purpose of favouring their opinions and presumptions, though the one or the other party call its book κατα Ματθαιον.

[d] Ἐγενετο τις ἀνηρ ὀνοματι Ἰησους, και αὐτος ὡς ἐτων τριακοντα ἐξελεξατο ἡμας· και ἐλθων εἰς Καφαρναουμ εἰσηλθεν εἰς την οἰκιαν Σιμωνος του ἐπικληθεντος Πετρου, και ἀνοιξας το στομα αὐτου εἰπε· παρερχομενος παρα την λιμνην Τιβεριαδος ἐξελεξαμην Ἰωαννην και Ἰακωβον υἱους Ζεβεδαιου, και Σιμωνα, και Ἀνδρεαν, και Θαδδαιον και Σιμωνα τον Ζηλωτην, και Ἰουδαν τον Ἰσκαριωτην, και σε τον Ματθαιον καθεζομενον ἐπι του τελωνιου, και ἠκολουθησας μοι.

If there were two originally different works, one of them is a certain proof, that the extravagant adherence to Judaism and passion for schism have misled the one party to compose for themselves a book agreeable to their prejudices and opinions, or arbitrarily to establish an extant Hebrew treatise which was the most conformable to their opinions, as an acknowledged ground of Religion. Of one party it is incontrovertibly true; but are not both accused of the same Judaical fanaticism by history?—were not both parties, according to its accusations against them, equally agreeable to the undertaking, and induced to it for the purpose of favouring their Jewish opinions and assertions?—and were they not invited to it by the sayings of Jesus, which were extant in the real Gospels, respecting the Sabbath and other Jewish customs which they wished to be observed, however otherwise they might be inclined to coincide in their books, opinions, with each other?—and what then were more natural, than that they should support their writings and opinions by a nominal authority, and ascribe them to Matthew, or even to all the Apostles?

SECTION X.

Matthew was desirous of being understood in the country, which he intended more immediately to be influenced by his Gospel; it is therefore not superfluous, if we wish to form a judgment upon his situation as an author, to observe, on the authority of correct representations, the state, in which he found the language of the country. According to some the Greek language had at that time acquired a considerable estimation next to the language

of the country[e]: but if, again, we listen to others, we should doubt, whether any one in Palestine understood Greek; whether Peter, John, James, Jude, and even Matthew had any knowledge of this language, which might be peculiarly expected from a man engaged in the business of collecting customs[f]. But if we cast our eyes upon the changes which took place in those countries we shall come to a very different result.

By the conquest of the Macedonians the state of Asia underwent many changes as to opinion, customs, science and language, the history of which, from want of documents will never be entirely developed. What I say here respecting the language is principally directed to Palestine.

What shall we say (such are the words of an old author) to Greek cities in barbarous countries, and to the Macedonian language among the Indians and among the Persians[g]? For the Macedonians had built Greek cities even in Media[h]. On the Tigris, Seleucia was principally inhabited by Greeks[i]; to

[e] The authors upon this subject have been specified by Kuinoel, in Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. in Edit. Harles. T. iv. L. iv. c. 7. p. 760. To these add, Dominici Deodati J. C. Neapolitani de Christo Græce loquente. 8vo. Neapoli, 1767. I could not obtain this treatise even at Naples. Fr. Guil. Shubert dissertat. quâ in sermonem, quo Evangel. Matthæi conscriptum fuerit, inquiritur. Götting. 1810.

[f] Giambernado de Rossi, della lingua propria di Christo, etc. Parma. 8. 1772. It is particularly directed against Diodati. The celebrated author sometimes confounds different ages: often makes use of bad weapons; but is a sturdy combatant.

[g] Seneca consolat. ad Helvid. c. 6.

[h] εἰσι δε και Ἑλληνιδες πολεις κτισματα των Μακεδονων ἐν τῃ Μεδιᾳ. Strabo L. xi. p. 524. secund. Casaub.

[i] Jos. Ant. L. xviii. c. 9. n. 8. οἰκουσι δε αὐτην (Σελευκειαν) πολλοι των Μακεδονων, και πλειστοι Ἑλληνες.

the south-east was the magnificent Ctesiphon[k]; and to the north-west was Sittace[l].

Babylon imitated Macedonia; in its neighbourhood lived Greeks and Macedonians[m]. But, not to enter into details, we refer (in Appian) to a large catalogue of cities in Upper and Lower Syria which were assigned to the Greeks[n]. Tigranes, the Armenian, in his march to Phœnicia, by way of Syria, destroyed no less than twelve Greek cities[o]. Between Syria and Babylonia we meet with the ruins of Palmyra, which are inscribed with inscriptions less Palmyrene than Grecian[p]. Even some, written in the Palmyrene character, are, nevertheless, in their language, Greek[q]. In Upper Syria, on the boundaries of Palestine, and in Palestine itself, the Greeks, as far as the situation and neighbourhood admitted it, made still greater intrusions. The many disturbances which here took place furnished great inducements to them. The Ptolemies and Seleucidæ had a long contest for the possession of

[k] Ibid. n. 9. Κτησιφωντα. . . . πολιν Ἑλληνιδα.

[l] Plin. H. N. L. 6. c. 31. oppidum ejus Sittace Græcorum: ab ortu est, should be thus pointed: oppidum ejus Sittace Græcorum: ab ortu est Sabbata: ab occasu autem Antiochia.

[m] Plin. H. N. L. vi. c. 30. Babylonia . . . . . libera hodie ac sui juris, Macedonumque moris. Joseph. Ant. c. 5. n. 11. και γαρ οι ταυτη κατοικουντες Ἑλληνες και Μακεδονες. λ.

[n] Appian. de. reb. Syriac. c. LVII. T. 1. p. 622, 23. edit. Schweigh.

[o] Strabo. L. xi. towards the end.

[p] Rob. Wood, the ruins of Palmyra, otherwise Tadmor in the desart. Lond. 1753. fol. contains 26 Greek inscriptions, and only 18 Palmyrene. Also Corn. le. Brun. Voyage au Levant, Paris 1714. gives, from the original English accounts, the Greek inscriptions, pa. 345—66.

[q] Barthelemy, Reflexions sur l'alphabet et sur la langue dont on se servoit autrefois à Palmyre, in the Memoires de l'Academie des Inscript. et Belles Lettres. T. xlv. 8. p. 179. seq.

these countries; they brought their Greeks with them, and placed them as governors and as inhabitants of the older and more recently built cities, lodging them as garrisons in them.

Antioch, the capital of Upper Syria, bordering on Palestine, was, by its founder, peopled with Macedonians and Greeks [r], and obtained the reputation of Greek refinement and science [s]. Not only in Antioch, but in several cities of Lower Syria, ἐν τῇ κατω Συρίᾳ, Macedonians and Greeks, together with Jews, were introduced as inhabitants [t].

Likewise, Tyre and Sidon, cities yet more ancient, which were under fewer restrictions and treated with distinction on account of their consequence, yielded to the Greek influence, and changed their language. When the rulers of the Roman empire, had established their dominion in these countries, they ordered the edict which they published at Tyre, to be exposed in the public places, in two languages, viz. the Latin and the Greek, that every one might be able to read it [u]. The same must have happened at Sidon: for, a Roman edict, in the Greek and Latin languages [x], must have been known. A general order to the cities of Tyre, Sidon,

[r] Joseph. Ant. L. xii. c. 3. n. 3. Bell. Jud. L. vii. c. 3. n. 3.

[s] Cicero pro Archia poeta, c. 3. Archias was born at Antioch, loco nobili, celebri quondam urbe et copiosâ, atque eruditissimis hominibus, liberalissimisque studiis affluenti. *rel.*

[t] Jos. Ant. c. xii. c. 12. και γαρ Σελευκος ὁ Νικατωρ, ἐν αἰς ἐκτισε πολεσιν ἐν τῃ Ἀσιᾳ και τῃ κατω Συρίᾳ . . . . . τους ἐνοικισθεισιν ἰσοτιμους ἀπεδειξε Μακεδοσι και Ἕλλησιν . . . τους Ἰουδαιους.

[u] Jos. Ant. L. xii. c. 12. n. 5. ἐν' αὐτο (διαταγμα) εἰς τας δημοσιους ἐπαἰρητε δελτους γραμμασι Ῥωμαϊκοις και Ἑλληνικοις, ἐν τῳ ἐπιφανεστατῳ ἐχητε αὐτο γεγραμμενον, ὁπως ὑπο παντων ἀναγινωσκεσθαι δυνησεται.

[x] Jos. Ant. L. xiv. c. 10. n. 2. Βουλομαι δε και ἑλληνιστι και Ῥωμαϊστι ἐν δελτῳ χαλκῃ τουτο ἀνατεθηναι.

and Askalon, contains the same clause: "This edict shall be exposed in the temples in the Latin and Greek languages [y]." In the above-mentioned edicts the language of the legislators, as well as that of those upon whom it was incumbent to obey them, was naturally taken into consideration. As to Sidon itself, a decree of the city (somewhere about the years 144—47, before our æra) is preserved upon a marble, worded in the Greek language, by which it pays honor to the commander of the body-guard of Ptolemy Philometor [z]. Askalon is particularly worthy of our notice, being situated in Palestine, because at several epochs it constituted a part of the Jewish state. It moreover produced men who distinguished themselves in Greek learning, as philosophers, historians, and grammarians [a]. Such was the fate of the principal cities.

The Jews, indeed, when the incursions under Antiochus Epiphanes became too serious, preserved themselves in the interior of the country, with arms in their hands, by means of the bravery of their Asmonæan chiefs, from the language and the manners of the Greeks; but many of the cities, which the Syrian kings had torn from the Jewish states

[y] Jos. Ant. L. xiv. c. 10. n. 3.

[z] Voyage du Paul Lucas dans la Gréce, l'Asie mineure, et L'Afrique. T. ii. (the second Voyage). After the second part, (Inscriptions trouvées à Seide, n. 5.) is the said decree of the city. Ptolemy Philometor had Cleopatra his sister to wife, and banished Demetrius, Soter and Alexander from the kingdom of Syria: then placed upon his own head the crown of Egypt and Syria. I. Maccab. xi. 8—13. The Inscription I read thus: Ἡ πολις Ἀριαν Δαμοθετου, κρητα, τον ἀρχισωματοφυλακα, και ἐπι της πολεως ἀρετης ἑνεκεν· και εὐνοιας της εἰς βασιλεα Πτολεμαιον και βασιλισσαν Κλεοπατραν. την ἀδελφην θεους φιλομητορας, και τεκνα αὐτων, και της εἰς αὐτην εὐεργεσιας.

[a] Stephan. de Urbib. V. Ἀσκαλων.

and peopled with other inhabitants, they were not able to regain.

This glory remained for Aristobulus and Alexander, the first Asmonæans, who assumed royal dignity. At the death of the latter they were all, together with several others, brought under subjection to the Jews; or, destroyed, where the inhabitants would not embrace Judaism [b]. Yet that was not of long duration.

Pompey on his return from his expedition against Mithridates, conducting his legions through Syria, took advantage of the dissensions among the Jewish princes, to render Palestine dependent on the Romans. On this occasion he recovered from the Jews the cities which they had taken from the Syrian kings, ordered those which had been demolished to be rebuilt, and the latter as well as the former to be restored to their former inhabitants. These were Gadara, Hyppos, Scythopolis, Pella, Dios, Samaria, Marissa, Azotus, Jamnia, Arethusa, Gaza, Joppa, Dora, and Straton's Tower [c]. At that time the following were rebuilt: Samaria, Azotus, Scythopolis, Anthedon, Raphia, Dora, Marissa, and Gaza [d]. In all probability, they were all, if not entirely, at least partially, inhabited by Greeks, or by Syrians who spoke Greek.

Respecting some of them we can declare it with certainty. Dora, once a city of Galilee, subsequently disputed with the Jews their right of citizenship. Claudius decided the dispute, and adjudged to the Jews an equal right of citizenship

[b] Jos. Ant. xiii. c. 15. n. 14
[c] Jos. Ant. xiv. c. 4. n. 4.
[d] Jos. Ant. xiv. c. 5. n. 3.

with the Greeks [e]. Gadara and Hippos, on the east of Galilee, had entirely become Greek cities [f]. The former even possessed men famous in Greek sciences [g]. In the heart of Palestine, between Galilee and Judæa, and formerly belonging to the former, lay Bethsan, called by the Greeks Scythopolis [h]. The Greeks who resided here, after having changed the name of the city, traced back its origin in Greek mythology to Dionysus [i], and called themselves, upon their coins, Nysæan-Scythopolitans. As to other particulars, they made themselves memorable by petty treacheries against their Jewish fellow-citizens [k]. On the south-west border of Judæa we meet with Gaza, a city of the Greeks [l].

That Joppa did not remain free from the influence of the Greek language may be inferred from its fate: on account of its situation and the impor-

[e] Jos. Ant. xix. c. 6. n. 3. ἐτι μεντοι και συμπολιτευεσθαι τοις ἑλλησι.

[f] Jos. Ant. xvi. c. 11. n. 4. Γαδαρα και Ἱππος ἑλληνιδες εἰσι πολεις. Compare Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 6. n. 3.

[g] Strabo, L. xvi. p. 759. 2da Casauboni.

[h] Βαιθσαν occurs (Joshua xvii. 11.) in the Alexandrine translation without explanation, but in Judges, l. 27. Βαιθσαν ἡ ἐστι Σκυθων πολις· The first of the prophane writers in whom we find Σκυθων πολιν is Polybius, L. v. c. 70. n. 4.

[i] The fable is in Pliny and Solinus. Liebe Gotha numaria, p. 235, 36. has cited it in examination of their coins, which are inscribed Νυσαιων των και Σκυθοπολιτων. Compare Eckhel doctrin. num. vet. P. i. Vol. iii. p. 439.

[k] Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 18. n. 3. 4. vitâ Josephi, c. 6. The Scythopolitans summoned the neighbouring Jews to the defence of the city against their mutinous countrymen. They rushed to arms and were victorious: but were fallen upon unawares by the Scythopolitans, and, in return for it, put to death. These were Greeks as we see from a long speech in Bell. Jud. L. vii. c. 8. p. 429.

[l] Jos. Ant. L. xvii. c. 11. n. 4. Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 6. n. 3.

tance of its harbour, the Alexandrian and Syrian kings often took it from the Jews, and kept it in a state of defence by means of their garrisons [m]. In the days of Strabo [n] the Grecian fable of Andromeda was already transplanted hither, for the purpose of procuring antient fame for the place, and of retracing it back to times when no Judaism yet existed.

Afterwards Herod found means to elevate himself to the throne of the Asmonæans through the favor of Antony, and afterwards through that of Augustus. When he saw himself secured in the possession of it, he, and his sons after him, either built new cities in honor of the Cæsars, or embellished the old ones, and put Greek inhabitants into them. The greatest and most magnificent was Cæsarea, the capital of the country next to Jerusalem, and principally peopled with Greeks [o]. But they became so ungrateful after the death of the king that they denied to the Jews a share in the city. Nero afterwards declared, against the Jews, that the Greeks were the masters of the city [p]. They fared worse at Tiberias; under the same king, the Jews fell upon their fellow-citizens, the Greeks, and completely overthrew them [q]. Chance has thus far furnished us with testimonials of the history of the Herodian cities: if the catalogue be not very copious, let it be recollected, that

[m] Diodor. Sic. L. xix. c. 59. and 93. 1 Macc. x. 75. xii. 33. 34. xiii. 11. xiv. 34. 2 Macc. xii. 3. Joseph. Ant. L. xiii. c. 9. n. 2. xiv. c. 10. n. 22.

[n] Strabo. L. xvi. p. 759. also Pliny, Mela and Solinus.

[o] Bell. Jud. L. iii. c. 9. Καισαρειαν μεγιστην της δε Ἰουδαιας τολιν, και το πλεον ὑφ' ἑλληνων ἐνοικουμενην. Compare L. ii. c. 13. n. 7.

[p] Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 14. n. 4. και οἱ Καισαρεων ἑλληνες, νικησαντες παρα Νερωνι της πολεως ἀρχειν.

[q] Vita Josephi. c. 12. where the inhabitants killed παντας τους ἐνοικουντας ἑλληνας.

I am referred to only one source, namely, Josephus, who only makes mention of the Greeks when a remarkable circumstance requires him to do so.

Respecting other cities we can only infer from circumstances or from the testimonies of Numismata. Cæsarea on the Panius, built by Philip, had temples, theatres, a stadium, and coins stamped in the Greek language, under Augustus, Caius Cæsar, &c. The inscriptions of others can be easily sought in Eckhel and Rasche.

Josephus gives us a larger catalogue of cities upon which the Jews revenged themselves for the cruel wrongs which they had suffered from the Greeks in Cæsarea [r]. It is natural to suppose that they were Greek cities which were made to expiate the crimes of the Greeks in Cæsarea. Among them are such as we have just mentioned as Greek cities: Gadara, Hippos, Scythopolis, Askalon, Gaza; from which we distinctly see what sort of cities is meant. The historian, indeed, does not, in this place, call those of Cæsarea Grecians, as he did elsewhere, but Syrians; and the cities Syrian cities. But this is explained by the fact that Josephus, in Lower Syria [s], carefully distinguishes the Greeks and Syrians, —while, on the contrary, in *Upper Syria*, he uses Ἑλλην and Συρος alternately, and as synonymous; as if no farther difference existed here between Greek and Syrian [t].

These are the cities which he names. In the north-east, Philadelphia, Gerasa, Pella, Gadara, Hippos; farther southward, Scythopolis. Westward,

[r] Bell. Jud. Lib. ii. c. 18.

[s] Jos. Antiq. L. xviii. c. 9. n. 8 and 9.

[t] Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 13. n. 7. compare c. 14. n. 4. vita Josephi. c. ii. Antiq. L. xvii. c. 5. n. 7. Histoire de l'Academie des Inscript. et Belles Lettres. T. ii. p. 170, 71. in 8vo.

Kedasa; by the sea, Ptolemais, Gaba, Cæsarea, Askalon, Anthedon, Gaza; more inland, Sebaste.

If we also inspect this catalogue, and keep exclusively in view those cities which history particularly or partially points out distinctly as belonging to the Greeks: Antioch and its environs near Palestine, Tyre and Sidon, with their dominions bordering upon each other, and often at variance with Galilee concerning the boundaries; in the country itself, Dora, Gadara, Hippos, Tiberias, Scythopolis, Cæsarea, formerly Straton's-tower: Askalon, Gaza;— we see from thence that Palestine had received into her *bosom* a second nation, (not reckoning the other swarms of people of various extraction), and divided herself between two languages, the language of the country and the Greek.

From the time of Pompey, the opposition against the incursion of the Greeks was removed; the barriers were not only broken, but the Greeks were even the favored party. They became still more so under Herod the first, who did not conceal from the Jews that he gave the preference to the Greeks [u], and *did* not stop at this confession, but by costly preparations even manifested that it was his purpose to hellenize the Jews.

He built at Cæsarea a theatre and an amphitheatre [x]; at Jericho, a stadium, amphitheatre and theatre [y]; a stadium, and an amphitheatre under the walls of the holy city, and at last a theatre even within its circumference [z]. The immense expence of

[u] Ἕλλησι πλεον ἢ Ἰουδαιοις οἰκειως ἐχειν ὁμολογουμενος. Jos. Ant. xix. c. 7. n. 5.

[x] Jos. Ant. xv. c. 9. pa. 773. compare xvi. c. 5.

[y] Bell. Jud. L. i. c. 33. n. 6. 8. pa. 141. 42. Antiq. xvii. c. 6. n. 5. L. xvii. c. 6. n. 3. p. 844.

[z] Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 9. n. 3. Antiq. xv. c. 8. p. 766. Θεατρον ἐν

this species of edifices, particularly in the interior of the country, at Jericho, and even in Jerusalem, shews how much he was resolved to accustom the Jews to the Greek drama and to the sanguinary diversions of the Roman combats.

What the subsequent Roman government, which was conducted by the procurators and the prætors of Syria, under whom they were placed, contributed to the adoption of the Greek language or retarded it, deserves an enquiry which may be proposed in the following manner: In what language did the prætors of Syria and the administrators of Judæa, Vitellius, Petronius, Pilate, *speak* when they sat as judges, and when they addressed the assemblies of the people?

Formerly it was customary for the Roman governors to speak only in their own language; even in places where they were not understood, as in Greece and Asia. Up to the reign of Tiberius the ancient custom had so far been laid aside that, according to the declaration of a cotemporary, the places in which the senate assembled at Rome, resounded, even to deafening, with Greek debates[a]. Where they formerly heard the Greek ambassadors only through the medium of an interpreter, and answered them in the same manner[b], a Roman emperor now made lengthened speeches to them in the Greek language[c].

Ἱεροσολυμοις ψκοδομησεν. Compare Eichhorn de Judæorum re scenicâ commentat. Soc. R. Scient. Gœtting. recentior. Vol. ii. Class. Antiq. p. 10—13.

[a] Valer. Max. L. ii. c. 2. n. 2. 3.

[b] Aul. Gell. Noct. Att. L. vii. c. 14.

[c] Suetonius. Claudius. c. 42. He only made difference with ambassadors of Roman descent and who resided in the Provinces. These he addressed in Latin, and desired a Latin answer. Dio. Cass. L. LX. p. 676. edit. Wechel. 1606. Sueton. Claudius. c. 16.

When they presided as judges they frequently gave Roman judgments in Greek words. When Tiberius made an exception in this particular, and refused to admit the testimony of a centurion in the Greek language, the historian observes; that the emperor was not herein consistent,—for, in the same courts, he had taken many depositions in this language and pronounced many decisions in it[d]. Verses of Homer were often interspersed in the judgments of Claudius[e], and he frequently met with annoyances through the forwardness of the Greeks[f]. When Nero first appeared on public business, he spoke in favor of the affairs of the Bononians, and for those of the Rhodians and the Ilienses, before the consul, for the first in Latin, for the others in Greek[g].

Since the emperors in Rome itself administered justice to the provincials in the Greek language; since the affairs of the Greeks, which their ambassadors brought forward; were discussed in the senate and before the consuls in the Greek language—we must infer that such was the manner of proceeding by the Romans in Greece and Asia.

We are not destitute of examples on this point. Cicero, at Syracuse, spoke in the Greek senate in the Greek language, with which Verres reproached

[d] Dio. Cass. L. lvii. p. 612. Wechel and Rob. Steph. p. 419. Suetonius confines it only thus far: Sermone Græco . . . non tamen usquequaque usus est. Abstinuit maxime in senatu. Tiber. c. 71. Wherever he made use of the Latin language he took great pains to speak and write it purely. Dio. L. lvii. p. 618. Wech. and Rob. Steph. p. 420. compare Sueton. de illustri grammat. c. 22.

[e] Sueton. Claud. c. 42.

[f] Sueton. Claud. c. 15.

[g] Sueton. Nero. c. 7. compare Seneca controvers. L. iv. p. 291. Bipont.

him[h]; he, however, was not very likely to do any thing in his professional capacity which he was not able to justify by precedents. P. Crassus, who, as proconsul, was commissioned to wage war with Aristonicus in Asia, carried it so far that he answered and issued his commands to each of the Greek tribes in its own dialect, accordingly as he was addressed; to the Ionians in Ionic, to the Œolians in Œolic[i]. Augustus, as conqueror and Autocrat, addressed the people of Alexandria in the Greek language[k]. Through Greek eloquence Mucius persuaded the people of Antioch to declare for Vespasian[l]. The Greek language even appears to have been the court-language of the proconsuls of Asia and Syria[m].

But, once more: of what language did the procurators of Palestine, Pilate, Porcius Festus, make use when they presided as judges? or the prætors of Syria, Petronius, Vitellius, when they, as was frequently the case, addressed the people?—That the Romans in Syria and Phœnicia made use of the Greek language we know from the preceding proofs; but that they made use of an interpreter in Palestine, is no where hinted at, either in Josephus or in the sacred books.

With respect to the people, the superior orders could scarcely do without this language on account of the new circumstances of society: but with respect to the multitude, it was decided by that, which was adventitious, the sphere in which each moved and his

[h] Cicero, in Verr. L. iv. c. 66.
[i] Valer. Max. L. vii. c. 7. n. 6.
[k] Dio. Cass. L. li. p. 254. Wech. and Rob. Steph. p. 307.
[l] Tacit. Hist. L. ii. c. 8.
[m] Seneca Ep. xii. de Ira, L. ii. c. 5.

business. "Few of my countrymen," says Josephus at the end of his Archæologia, "would have been able to compose this book in the Greek language, on account of their deficiency in the grammatical knowledge of it, in which I can boast myself superior to others; although I do not speak it well myself on account of the established manners of my country. For with us the knowledge of foreign languages and the quickness and elegance of pronunciation are accounted vulgar, since the free people of a low class could also acquire them, and even the domestics if they were inclined. We only permit *erudite* acquisitions to those who are acquainted with the laws and are able to explain the sacred books."

A knowledge of the more ancient language and of the religious documents was consequently an object of the higher sort of Jewish education. Even for the existing language of the people, for the Aramaic, there were no places of tuition. In the same manner was the Greek language neglected; the Jews understood it, but not grammatically, and learned it by connexion and intercourse, in which manner it was communicated to the lower orders, who, if instruction had been offered, were not in a situation to receive it.

The religious authorities were so little opposed to the diffusion of the Greek language that they esteemed and honored it above every other language. Works written in it were reckoned among the books of Hebrew learning, and even in legal cases which came in contact with religion the use of it was admitted. Thus are we informed by the oldest, and the most to be relied on, of the Talmudic records, viz. the Mishnah, for I do not intend to notice all the later dreams of the Jews.

"The Jews are not permitted to compose books in all languages; it shall only be permitted them *to write books* in the GREEK." This is a declaration of Rabbi Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, which was acknowledged as a statute [n].

A bill of divorce might be written in GREEK or HEBREW, or, if it were wished, in both languages, and might also be signed by the witnesses in GREEK or HEBREW; in either language, and with either subscription, it was valid [o]. Yet had the Jews many scruples in regard to this business, and allowed to a non-Judaic court of justice no voice whatever in it, and acknowledged no one as a sufficient witness in such cases, unless it were one of their own people [p]. So indulgent had the Jews become in a legal process which innovated on the religious and Mosaic casuistry.

The first prohibition against the Greek occurs

[n] Mishn. Tract. Megill. c. 1. n. 8. רבן שמעון בן גמליאל אומר אף בספרים לא התירו שיכתבו אלא יונית: According to the explanation of R. B. Maimon and of Obadiah Bartenora the הלכה or observance was according to R. Simeon's decision, compare c. 11. n. 1. where the two Rabbis declare it to be indifferent whether the Megillah is read in Chaldaic or in Greek. Through this the objection of a learned man is removed, who maintained that it was contrary to the ancient customs, for a Jew of Palestine (Matthew) to have written a book in the Greek language. Bertholdt, Hist. Introd. to the writings of the Old and New Testaments, part. iii. § 320. p. 1176. The passage to which he referred (Joseph. Antiq. Procem. n. 2.) only speaks of the difficulties of expressing oneself in a foreign language according to its peculiarities, for Josephus wished not only to write Greek but to write it elegantly. Ant. L. xiv. at the commencement.

[o] Mish. Fr. Gitin. c. ix. n. 8. נט שכתבו עברית ועדיו יונית יונית ועדיו עברית ער אחד עברי ועד אחר יוני כתב סופר ועד כשר: Compare herewith the preceding Section in the same paragraph, Gitin.

[p] Gitin. c. i. n. 5.

in the later days of the Jewish state when Titus threatened Jerusalem. In the war of Vespasian the wreath of the bridegroom and the hand-drums were abolished by public order; but in the war of Titus the use of the brides' wreaths was also interdicted, and the fathers were commanded henceforward to prevent their sons from learning Greek [q].

From this prohibition we might explain, if it were necessary, why Josephus being sent by Titus to persuade the besieged to less desperate measures, spoke to them in their native language, ἐν πατρίῳ γλωσσῃ and ἑβραΐζων. Bell. Jud. L. v. c. 9. n. 2.; L. vi. c. 2. n. 1. But even if this prohibition had not been issued, there existed in the old ancestorial sound a token of like extraction and of like interest in the fate of the native land, and on that account it possessed an inducement to confidence. Thus it was considered by Titus [r]; how could we then ever look upon it as a proof of the ignorance of the besieged respecting the Greek language?

I must moreover state in addition, that when the revolters, in the last decisive moments, seemed to have become a little more humble they requested a conference with Titus. He had never before appeared in negociations. He approached, ordered the Romans to cease hostilities, had an interpreter at his side, (ὅπερ ἦν τεκμηριον του κρατειν, as Josephus adds) and began the conference himself [s]. Here he spoke by means of an interpreter: could this person

[q] Mish. in Sotah. c. ix. n. 14. בפלמוס של מיטים נזרו על עטרות כלות ושלא ילמד אדם את בנו יונית:

[r] ταχα ἐνδουναι προς ὁμοφυλον δοκων αὐτους. Bell. Jud. L. v. c. 9. n. 2.

[s] Bell. Jud. L. vi. c. 6.

have been present for the purpose of translating the words of Titus into Hebrew? For that office he would rather have chosen Josephus; but he, who never forgets *himself* in the history, was not the person: had it been, he would have mentioned it. Also the interpreter was not present for the purpose of speaking Hebrew, πατριῳ γλωσσῃ, which Josephus would not have omitted to mention. For what purpose then, one may ask, was the interpreter necessary? The words of the historian explain it if we be willing to understand them. The emperor spoke *ex majestate imperii*, that is, LATIN, after the manner of the old Romans: thus much the words signify: ὁπερ ἠν τεκμηριον του κρατειν, this was the distinguishing mark of the sovereign, which has been falsely interpreted by the following passage, *primus, quod victoris indicium, dicere instituit.* It would have been better to have preserved the translation of Ruffin, who, at least, is nearer to the mark; *adhibitoque interprete, quo argumento superior ostendebatur.*

The interpreter then translated his words into a language more generally understood, but, as we inferred from the manner of Josephus, not into the Hebrew. What language could it then have been? Besides, it is mentioned, in corroboration, as praiseworthy in Titus that he made use of the *Latin language* in state affairs; but, in his scientific amusements, of the Greek[1].

We now return to our subject. It is then no longer doubtful, that up to the time in which Matthew wrote, the Greek language had firmly rooted

[1] Suidas. V. Τιτος—τῃ μεν Λατινων ἐπιχωριῳ γλωττῃ προς τας των κοινων ἐχρητο διοικησεις, ποιηματα δε και τραγῳδιας ἑλλαδι φωνῃ διεπονειτο.

itself in Palestine. But what relation existed between the two languages, is not yet, from the connexion of all these facts, quite obvious. One scene in Paul's life promises us some explanation on this head. At Jerusalem, in an insurrection which was raised against him in the temple, he was saved, with difficulty, by means of the guards; he demands permission to address the assembled people; he ascends the steps and addresses them in the Hebrew language: Acts of Apost. xxi. 40. This pleased them, and we see in it the predilection for the language of the country. But this approbation shows at the same time that the people might have been addressed in a different language: the relation of the historian even shows that the assembled crowd was already prepared for an address in another language. "When he had beckoned to them with his hand and a profound silence had ensued, he spoke to them in the Hebrew tongue: Men and brethren, hear now the defence which I make to you. When they now heard that he made use of the Hebrew dialect, the silence increased, μαλλον παρεσχον ἡσυχιαν, Act. Apost. xxi. 40.; xxii. 2." It is evident from the relation, that they expected an address in another language, and that they heard, to their great satisfaction, a defence in the Hebrew. But what language could they have expected? The complaint against Paul, and the immediate cause of the insurrection was, that he had introduced Greeks into the temple: Act. Apost. xxi. 28. His accusers were Grecian Jews from Ionia, who shortly before had seen Trophimus the Ephesian with him: Act. Apost. xi. 27—30. The accusation against him, and his accusers, lead us to expect only a Greek address. The case is so much the stronger, since it

does not concern individuals, but the people, who are his auditors, and the city which is in commotion. To judge by this scene, the people had a predilection for the language of the country; but in the mass there might have been many thousands of exceptions; the mass also understood Greek more from circumstances than from an inclination to foreign languages and manners. But it was on a festival; a great number of foreigners were present, according to custom, but yet the greater part were natives who had heard the Greek, and on that account delighted in the *Hebrew* language.

It may now appear less strange that even in the capital, the central point of Judaism, peculiar religious places of assembly were found, in which Greeks as belonging to the same country assembled and formed respectable congregations, such as the Alexandrians, the Syrians, and the Asiatics, &c. Act. Apost. vi. 9. ix. 29.

The Christian school of this city also consisted partly of members who spoke Greek, or Hellenists, who were numerous enough to support themselves in a dispute with the Jews. Act. Apost. vi. 1.

We are here drawn into a controversy which for the sake of omitting nothing, we cannot avoid. It was wished to exclude these Jews who spoke Greek, and the Judaic Christians from the Acts of the Apostles.

In order to get rid of them we have been referred to an explanation which had already been for a long time abandoned and which is to the following purport: "Hellenists are nothing but Proselytes, who were always holden in less esteem by the Jews who belonged to the twelve tribes or by the Hebrews in the more confined sense of the word, and who, in re-

ference to their Heathen extraction, were called Hellenists [a]."

At all events however they spoke Greek, and it is more probable they did so from the circumstance of having been of Heathen extraction, or, but lately, Heathens themselves. And who could expect any thing else from natives of Cilicia, and particularly of Cyrene, Alexandria and Ionia? Act. Apost. vi. 9. If we would prove, from the example of Philo, that the Alexandrians did also understand something of Hebrew, this could have been but very little, and besides this there were very few as learned as he was.

Let us analyse these notions a little. What is a Jew? What is a Hebrew? What is a Hellen? and what is a Hellenist? — The name of Jew (we speak of the times of our Lord and the Apostles) is the common expression for all who, according to their extraction, came from the ancient kingdom of Judah, on whatever part of the earth they might be living, (φυσει Ἰουδαιοι, Gal. ii. 15. παντες κατα την οἰκουμενην, Act. Apost. xxiv. 5.) and the religion of this race of men, γενος, is called Judaism, Ἰουδαϊσμος, Galat. i. 14. Therefore the Jews stand in contradistinction to the Heathens, ἐθνη, Rom. iii. 29. ix. 24. &c. or, also in contradistinction to the chief people of the Heathens, viz. the Greeks, ἑλληνων, Acts xviii. 4. Rom. ii. 9. x. 12. 1 Cor. i. 24. and to be addicted to Judaism, is, ἰουδαϊζειν; but a Pagan mode of life is ἐθνικως ζην, Gal. ii. 14. and never ἑλληνιζειν.—He who had departed from Heathenism and who had not yet been so long in it (Judaism) as to be considered by the nation as a fellow-

[a] On the language of the land of Palestine, in the time of Christ and the Apostles, according to de Rossi by Dr. Pfannkuche. In Eichhorn's General Library of Biblical Literature, vol. viii. part 2. p. 472.

citizen, was a Proselyte or a son of a Proselyte, Acts vi. 5. xiii. 43. And in Acts ii. 10. Ἰουδαιοι and προσηλυτοι, occur, for the whole of the professors of Judaism.

In the same manner as the Jews and the Greeks are opposed to each other, so also are the Hebrews and the Hellenists, Acts vi. 1. Wherein can that consist, by which the Hebrew distinguishes himself, and by which he distinguishes a subdivision of the general name of Jew? Certainly not in religion—IN THAT he is a Jew; not in extraction, φυσει, IN THAT ALSO, he is a Jew. In what else then can it consist but in the language? When we speak of customs, opinions, and religious worship, Ἰουδαικος only is used: but when we treat of the national language, writings and literature, then ἑβραϊκος is used; we say, ἑβραϊκη διαλεκτος, Acts xxii. 2, xxvi. 14. ἑβραϊκα γραμματα, Luke xxiii. 38. and we speak and write ἑβραϊστι, John xix. 17. 20 [x]. But we never say Ἰουδαϊκη διαλεκτος, Ἰουδαϊκα γραμματα, &c. It would therefore appear pretty evident, in what the Hebrew distinguished himself from his whole nation.

If then the peculiarity, by which the Hebrew distinguishes himself, consists in the language, we may likewise guess, wherein the peculiarity of the Hellenist, who is opposed to him, consists; THAT in like manner must be referred to the language. Hence, ἑβραϊζειν and ἑλληνιζειν were opposed to each other. The word ἑβραϊζειν means, in Josephus, to state any thing in the Hebrew language, τα του Καισαρος διηγγειλε ἑβραϊζων. Bell. Jud. L. vi. c. 3. n. 1. What then could ἑλληνιζειν be?—That which it has ever been,—to speak Greek; as, for instance, Thu-

[x] In Josephus de Maccabæis, the mother admonishes her sons, ἑβραϊκη φωνη § 14. and τη ἑβραϊδι διαλεκτῳ.

cydides says, ii. 48. ἐλληνισθησαν την νυν γλωσσαν, "they adopted the Greek language, which they now speak;" and Xenophon, Anab. vii. c. 3. n. 12. ἑλληνιζειν γαρ ἠπιστατο: or as Lucian, Philopseud. c. 16. says of the Dæmon, whom the native of Palestine drives out, ἀποκρινεται ἑλληνιζων ἡ βαρβαριζων, he answers in both languages of Palestine, in the language of the country, βαρβαριζων and in the Greek ἑλληνιζων. Accordingly, a Hellenist was well explained by the Scholiast to mean "a Jew by extraction who speaks Greek[y];" and even if John Chrysostom, as it seems to me, inferred this signification from the formation of the word only, still he was too good a Grecian, for us on this account to dispute his assertion[z]. If we consult one of the older Greek grammarians, we shall obtain from him the information, that from Ἑλλην comes ἑλληνιζω, thence ἑλληνιστι, as from Δωριζω, Δωριστι, Αἰολιζω, Αἰολιστι. The question respecting language and dialect is here decided[a]. Thus Hellenists are distinguished by the language, in consequence of which they are opposed to Jews speaking Hebrew or Aramaic:—they are men who speak Greek.

Still, (and here I principally complain of Bertholt) a great importance is always placed, as it should be, upon the circumstance of Jesus being introduced as speaking Hebrew, Mark v. 41. ταλιθα κουμι, vii. 34. ἐφφαθα, and Matthew xxvii. 46. Mark xv. 34. It might be replied, that the Hebrew words in these

[y] Schol. in Act. Apost. vi. i. edit. N. T. Frid. Matthæi, ἑλληνιστων—των ἑλληνιστι φθεγγομενων καιτοι ἑβραιων ὑντων τῳ γενει.

[z] J. Chrys. commentar. in Act. vi. 1. 9. ἑλληνιστων δε οἰμαι καλειν τους ἑλληνιστι φθεγγομενους, οὑτοι γαρ ἑλληνισται διελεγοντο ἑβραιοι ὀντες.

[a] Apollonius Alexandrin. in Imman. Bekkeri anecdotis Græcis, Vol. ii. p. 572.

passages are quoted by the Evangelists as remarkable occurrences, which would not have been the case, if Jesus had generally spoken Hebrew; and what could well be urged against this answer? Yet we will not dismiss the matter so abruptly. Our Lord might have spoken to the Jewish multitude in Hebrew, because they were predisposed to listen to it. But how did he speak to a mixed assembly, collected from different parts and different cities? How did he speak to Proselytes and Heathens: how at Gadaris? Matt. viii. 28. Mark v. 1. Luke viii. 26. How in the districts of Tyre and Sidon, Mark vii. 24. where the Syrophœnician Greek woman, γυνη Ἑλληνις Συροφοινικισσα, entered into conversation with him? How at Decapolis, which, as far as we know, consisted of Greek cities, such as Philadelphia, Hippos, Pella?

Finally, even if Jesus more frequently spoke Hebrew, in what manner does that affect Matthew, who had not to speak to detached parties, which went to and fro,—sometimes to Hebrews and sometimes to Hellenists,—and who could not accordingly change his language; who must have conceived to himself a fixed class of men, and chosen his language according to them, in which, the present and a future generation, to which perhaps the Hebrew might become less familiar, were included.

Let us now collect the observations which we have made into one point of view.

I. Asia was, through the government of the Macedonians, filled, far and wide, with Greek cities. In Upper Asia a greater number were erected by the dynasty of the Ptolemies, and principally of the Seleucidæ. More ancient cities, such as Tyre and

Sidon, changed their language in consequence of this influence.

II. Palestine lost to the Greeks many of its own cities. The Herods, instead of restoring this loss, built new cities. Some of these Greek cities were upon the borders of the country and some of them in the interior.

III. Herod the Great made an enormous expenditure to convert his Jews into Greeks.

IV. The Roman government rather promoted than opposed this progress to Hellenism.

V. The religious rulers also of the Jews threw so few obstacles in its way, that in the latter times of the state they shewed respect to the Greek language: they acknowledged it as the language of their literary works, and as admissible in legal transactions.

VI. Being thus favoured on all sides, this language was spread by means of traffic and intercourse through all classes, so that the people, (though with many exceptions) considered generally, understood it, although they adhered more to their own language.

VII. In the holy city itself whole congregations of Jews, who spoke Greek, were established. From these, and from Greek proselytes, the Christian school at Jerusalem was partly derived.

I. Let us imagine Matthew placed in these circumstances; if he wrote Greek, the mass of the

people understood him: but for that part of the people, who perhaps only spoke the language of the country, he was compensated by those cities which the Greeks had taken from the Jews, or by those which, through the favor of the Herods, they possessed as occupants and co-inhabitants, on the borders, or in the interior of the country: also by the Hellenistic communities in the holy city, and by the Hellenists in the Christian school, to whom he could not make himself understood in any other way. If he wrote Hebrew, he renounced the great, and perhaps the nobler part of the readers, whom we have just mentioned.

II. At the same time if he had the adjacent environs in his view; if he looked on Antioch, the capital of Syria, where the believers were first called Christians, Acts xi. 26.—or on the neighbouring Syrian churches, Acts xv. 23—41:—if he thought on Tyre where a Christian school already flourished, Acts xxi. 3, 4.;—on Sidon, Acts xxvii. 3.: and on other cities along the Phœnician coast (for they all fall within the compass of the view, which he may have taken in the composition of his work, (Section 2); all of which had an evident acquaintance with Palestine and its inhabitants;) he could no longer be undecided, to which language he should give the preference: he could choose none but the Greek.

III. If his whole thoughts were fixed on those latter times of the people, in which he wrote his book, believing the predictions of his Lord, which caused him to expect an approaching dissolution of the Jewish state, of the prelude to which he was himself already an eye-witness;—and if he even then wished to produce an effect, when it should be com-

pleted: if he wished to be still understood, when the remnant of the Jews, without a temple and without public worship, wandering about and destitute of homes in their own native land, should have yielded up their possessions to others: if he were not desirous of writing merely for a few years or a few months, then he would no longer have written in the language of this people, who in a short time would cease to exist as a people.

SECTION XI.

If this then was the state of the vernacular language in Palestine, we can no longer doubt that, besides the Nazoræans, or the small number of the natives, who most passionately adhered to the customs and the language of their native land, many others of their countrymen, who, being dispersed in different parts of Palestine, had embraced the Christian religion, read and understood an original Hebrew writing of Matthew, if such a one existed, and that they would hardly have exchanged that original for a Greek translation. The text must, therefore, by means of multiplied copies, have been dispersed in different parts of the country, and the copies of it could never have been so entirely destroyed, that nothing else remained of it but a fictitious vestige among the Nazoræan sect, or in the school of the Ebionites.

But likewise in Syria, viz. in the north-east of it, where the Syriac dialect had obstinately maintained itself, and where even in the second century Syriac literature and poetry was cultivated, such a book written in the Galilæan dialect could not fail of being welcome both for private use and for that of the

church. Its appearance in Hebrew characters would be no objection: for even these, if we may judge from the Palmyrene inscriptions, were of common occurrence in a great part of Syria; and even where they were not so, every objection was removed by the alteration of the characters [b]. The Christians could not even perceive the want of it, as the only book of assistance, until they had obtained a translation of the whole New Testament: and even when this translation was prepared, so little did they know and possess such an original book, that they, instead of preserving it as venerable original document, or of more perfectly adapting it, with some alterations, to their dialect, re-translated our GREEK text, that is to say, *if this was indeed* a translation.

Origen also obtained no trace of it; he could no where find any thing but the book κατ' ἑβραιους, the value of which, he left to each individual's judgment, yet the discovery of Matthew in his original language was of no less consequence to him, as his perseverance in investigations of this nature was indefatigable. In the same manner as he laboured upon the Old Testament for the sake of restoring the Septuagint, by reference to the original text and the other existing critical aids, so also was he occupied with a recension of the New Testament. The many faults, which had crept into Matthew, of which he expressly complains, were to be remedied in no more effectual way, than by consulting the original text as he had done in the Old Testament. He made, during twenty-eight years, various journeys for critical purposes, he drew many unused and forgotten MSS. out of their obscurity, in which they would perhaps have decayed, for the sake of leaving

[b] *i. e.*—the substitution of the Syriac characters.

no means unessayed to amend the Biblical text. His journeys were directed through Palestine and Syria, and at Tyre, he laboriously formed his critical apparatus. In spite of these troublesome and voluntary investigations, which this scientific man made, he no where discovered any trace of such an original Gospel of Matthew.

Pamphilus, a Phœnician from Barut, famed as a martyr, as the teacher of Eusebius, and on account of his Biblical learning, as a scholar, established, for the church at Cæsarea, a library, celebrated among the ancients, to furnish books for which he most carefully explored every direction. The treasure there provided in Biblical literature attracted Jerome also, who made use of it to advantage. But for this collection, Pamphilus had obtained no Hebrew copy of Matthew: it was only the Nazoræan book, that he could procure, which Jerome, who translated it, here examined[c]. So fruitless were the endeavours of the ancients to obtain a sight of the pretended original text of the Evangelist, that its existence seems to have been a mere report, and it no where appears to have existed.

SECTION XII.

The Gospel of Matthew which is in our possession, and which, according to the testimony of the most different and the most distant religious sects, from the first ages of Christianity, was attributed to

[c] Hieronym. de Script. Eccles. v. Pamphil. and v. Matth. also L. iii. adv. Pelag. In Evangelio juxta Hebræos . . . . quo utuntur usque hodie Nazareni . . . quod in Cæsareensi Bibliothecâ habetur, &c.

him, as its author, as the general introduction has shown, was originally written in Greek. For, the passages which are quoted from the Old Testament, are so treated in their Greek dress, that we must attribute the arrangements or modifications, which there occur, to the composer and not to a translator. For instance, they generally express the peculiarity of his views; and refer to the PRACTICAL parts of the history, which he in the course of it was desirous of exhibiting also to others.

Upon the whole, in these citations, the Alexandrian translation has been adopted and verbally followed. But the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, also, which he readily consulted, was at the command of the author of the Greek text of Matthew.

Where there was no particular necessity, but merely delicacy, in here and there adopting an expression more suitable to the subject, he deviated from the Seventy, and gave his passages a peculiar and a happy turn, conformable to the purport of his book. For instance, Isaiah xlii. 1. Nothing prevented him from making use of the passage as it was in the LXX.; but the words, οὐδε ἀκουσθησεται ἡ φωνη αὐτου ἐξω, which ישמיע בחוץ קולו strictly meant, were not sufficiently decisive and suitable to that on which the Greek expression depended, to designate the *character of the modest and wise man*, as it appeared in Jesus. He therefore rendered it more expressive of the idea of the Evangelist by a peculiar choice of expression. "*He shall not contend, and shall raise no cry, nor shall he cause his voice to be heard in the streets,*" οὐκ ἐρισει, οὐδε κραυγασει, οὐδε ἀκουσει τις ἐν ταις πλατειαις την φωνην αὐτου.—In this the quiet, unassuming character, and modesty of the great teacher were now visibly pourtrayed. Matt. xii. 19.

In Psalm lxxviii. 2. φθεγξομαι προβληματα απ' αρχης was perfectly adapted to him; but for doctrinal discourses, which were explanatory of the kingdom of the Messiah and its establishment, which Matthew chiefly laboured to substantiate by the quotations from the Old Testament, the words were not sufficiently cogent.

The scheme of happiness to be bestowed by the Messiah was accounted by the Jews a vast mystery of the Deity from all eternity, προεγνωσμενα απο καταβολης κοσμου. 1 Pet. i. 20. Ephes. i. 4. Heb. ix. 26. Απ' αρχης was too tame for this, and the word בעה contained in it a more lively idea; consequently, he imparted to the passage, by a better choice of expression, greater efficacy and force: ἑρευξομαι κεκρυμμενα απο καταβολης κοσμου. Matth. xiii. 35.

The translation in Isaiah liii. 4. of the words חלי and מכאב by ασθενεια and νοσος, (Matth. viii. 17.) is certainly so carefully weighed as to the scope of the author, that the Hebrew expression was far exceeded, in regard to the purpose of the Evangelist [d].

The words of Matthew xxvii. 9, 10. are doubtless taken from Zachariah, but they are a quotation from memory of which Jeremiah is cited as the source. It is as fully as unlikely that Matthew, for the sake of proving that Jesus was the Messiah, for which a strong dogmatical proof was required, should have

[d] A celebrated scholar expresses himself thus respecting this passage of the Evangelist. If he translated immediately from the Hebrew, he carefully chose ασθενειας and νοσους for חלי and מכאב for the sake of making the passage quite suitable to the cures of Christ. And even the use of these words renders a peculiar translation of Matthew in this place probable. Eichhorn, in the general Library of the Bib. Literature. ii. vol. part 6. p. 973.

referred to Apocrypha, against which an exception might be taken, and which could not have tended to give that unsuspicious appearance to his undertaking, which was requisite for conviction—as it is irregular and contrary to all investigations of the Canon, to presume, that since the days of Matthew a part of the Old Testament has been lost.

The passages and even the expressions are found in Zachariah, though the Evangelist (which is the characteristic of a citation from memory) does not arrange the words in precisely the same order. Zach. xi. 13, 14. ואקחה שלשים הכסף *και ἐλαβον τα τριακοντα ἀργυρια.*

Here, in the first place, we have the same sentence and the sum: then also the words, *την τιμην του τετιμημενου, ὁν ἐτιμησαντο,* היקר אשר יקרתי מעליהם: מעלהם is translated *ἀπο των υἱων Ἰσραηλ,* since בין ישראל for which he read בן, follows. Even the Potter is found in the original, *και ἐδωκαν εἰς τον ἀγρον του κεραμεως,* השליכהו אל אדר היוצר in the general use of the language יוצר is a Potter, as the literal Aquilas has expressed it by *πλαστης.* Lastly, the field also is mentioned, for אַדֶּר has, in the language of Ezra, and in the Chaldæo-Hebraic, this signification. Now we have all the ideas, which individualize the passage, and even the particular clauses also, and all the words, as they are contained in Matthew. The Greek version of them, which is quite conformable to the object and views of the Evangelist, would, as any person acquainted with the subject will confess, hardly have been so well executed by any but himself.

This peculiar manner of treating passages of the Old Testament rather displays the spirit of the author, who works according to his own ideas, and brings every thing to bear upon a preconceived plan, than a translator from whom it is not so easily to be

expected that he should enter so far into the ultimate views of the author, and act so comformably to them, as the author himself only could have done with the greatest reflection.

Yet well acquainted as the author of the Greek text was with the Hebrew Old Testament, there are, nevertheless, examples, which plainly show, that he had no Hebrew copy lying before him. One of these passages is from Isaiah xxix. 13., in Matthew xv. 9. The Seventy have indeed perceived its chief point, but they have by no means equalled the expression of the original text. For the expression *ματην*, we find nothing at all in the Hebrew: the LXX seem to have read תמם for ותהי, and for διδασκοντες no word exists in Isaiah. יראתם אתי has been translated by *σεβονται με*, as if it had been written יראו אתי;— מלמדה is considered as a noun in the plural, like מלמדות *διδασκαλιαι*. Nevertheless, this translation is given literally. We can perceive in it no translator, who had an Hebrew text before him, which he would otherwise have happily expressed, but rather the man who goes to work as an author, arbitrarily and confidently, with his own knowledge.

Finally, the passage in Matthew xix. 4, 5., which is quoted according to the Seventy, from Moses, Gen. 11, 24., pre-supposes the Greek text to have been originally the author's basis. The words *οι δυο εις σαρκα μιαν*, have a reading which is only in the Greek, namely, the *οι δυο* for although שנים, *οι δυο* be also found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, it yet is assuredly not the source, as an orthodox Jew never thinks of using this Pentateuch.

Now on this *οι δυο* rests the main strength of the argument: *ωστε ουκ ετι εισι* ΔΥΟ· *αλλα σαρξ μια*. For this argument, which the Evangelist here puts into the mouth of Jesus, there was in the Hebrew no-

thing equivalent: according to that, the argumentation אחד, μια σαρξ should have run and been put thus, και ἐσονται εἰς σαρκα μιαν, ὡστε εἰσιν ΕΝ κατα σαρκα. If then this conclusion, as it is given by Matthew, could not arise from the Hebrew, but only from the Greek premises, this also decides in favor of the original use of the latter language in this Gospel.

We shall now, for a short space, lose sight of this Evangelist, but only with a view of preparing for more extended investigations respecting him.

SECTION XIII.

MARK.

Johannes Marcus, whom the ancients asserted to have been a scholar and companion of Peter, was, as it appears, born in Jerusalem; at least his mother lived there, and in her house the believers held assemblies, Acts xii. 12: it was also thither that Peter first went when the angel conducted him from the prison, for he expected there to be received with the greatest joy. He was not deceived, and was received with every token of extraordinary joy.

Johannes Marcus and Marcus whom Peter mentions under so affectionate an appellation, 1 Pet. v. 13, can therefore hardly be separated, although the name of John is not prefixed to the latter[e]. It should not have escaped the learned, who on this ground have distinguished two persons, that the cognomen was the usual and the characteristic name, and that John ὁ ἐπικληθεις Μαρκος, Acts xii. 25, and Λεββαιος ὁ ἐπικληθεις Θαδδαιος,

[e] Grotius Præf. in Marc. Cave. Hist. litt. vol. i.

Ἰωσης ὁ ἐπικαλουμενος Βαρναβας, were, in common life, simply called Mark, Thaddæus, Barnabas.

The following series of events, which happened to this John who was called Mark, will still farther show that he and Mark are one and the same person.

When Paul and Barnabas were at Jerusalem, at the time of Peter being taken into custody, they took this John Mark with them to Antioch. When these two men were afterwards called by the Spirit to preach the doctrine of Jesus in other lands, they chose this John Mark as a servant and companion, Acts xiii. 5.

He went with them to Cyprus, but as they travelled on from Paphos to Perga, Mark forsook them and went back to Jerusalem, Acts xiii. 13.

Paul and Barnabas returned from their travels to Antioch; but their active minds did not suffer them to rest long. They resolved to visit their brethren again, that they might perceive the success of their undertaking and labours, Acts xv. 37. Barnabas wished to have Mark as a companion again, but Paul opposed it in a decided manner, because he had forsaken them the first time, and not persevered under difficulties. Barnabas on the other hand was equally firm, and chose rather to separate from his fellow-labourer, and went again with Mark to Cyprus. Paul made choice of Silas.

Henceforward, we no more find *John* Mark in the New Testament, but *Mark* only, Coloss. iv. 10, 11.; Timoth. iv. 11.; Philem. 24.: but from the first passage it is evident, that this Mark is the very same John Mark, whom Paul and Barnabas, at the first, chose as a companion, and on whose account they separated themselves. For, we learn here, that he was related to Barnabas, ἀνεψιος του Βαρναβα, and we therefore see, why Paul and Barnabas took him

with them from Jerusalem, and we perceive why Barnabas was so strongly attached to this Mark as to separate himself, on his account, from Paul, as to burst the ancient bonds of friendship and abandon their common object, for the sake of having the youth with him, and finally, why he went with him the second time to Cyprus. Barnabas was a Cyprian by birth, Acts iv. 36., and Mark, his kinsman, met here with several, who were connected with him by the ties of blood on the side of Barnabas.

Paul was again reconciled to him, and during his first imprisonment at Rome, admitted him to his society. When he sent him back from hence to Asia with commissions, he again sought out his old teacher, Peter, with whom he connected himself (as we perceive from the first Epistle of this Apostle, v. 13,) and whose amanuensis he seems to have been in the composition of this epistle.

SECTION XIV.

As at the time when Peter was imprisoned under Agrippa, Mark, who left Jerusalem with Paul, was yet a youth, and as nothing any where appears to constitute him an eye witness of the actions and adventures of Jesus, we naturally ask for the source of his accounts and for the credentials of his historical authority. Whence then was Mark instructed in the facts which he relates?

When we see, that an assembly of the believers took place in the house of his mother,—that Peter went thither first after his liberation,—that he, in the presence of all the believing Jews, honors him with the tender appellation Μαρκος ὁ υἱος μου, 1 Pet. v. 13., there is no doubt that he granted to him his

paternal care, which, in the mouth of an Apostle, would principally be directed to instructions. We must therefore ascribe principally to Peter his knowledge respecting the doctrines and the history of Jesus. But that, independent of a general information, he might have derived particular assistance and immediate instructions from the Apostle in his labours, we may, from the preceding facts, conclude to be probable, but not to be demonstrated.

History however plainly assures us of it. Papias, indeed, is again the first witness, and his assurance, unless corroborated by authorities under name, is but *little* satisfactory to us. But on this occasion he expressly refers to his guarantee, viz. John, an Ephesian Presbyter, who was probably cotemporary with the occurrence, but certainly with John the Evangelist, and by means of his circumstances and great age, knew something certain respecting the records of Christianity. According to his account, οὗτος ὁ πρεσβυτερος λεγει, Mark was no immediate scholar of our Lord, but was the companion of Peter, and was united to him in a close intimacy, to whose discourses in public assemblies he always paid the strictest attention, writing them down, and working them into a history. (Euseb. at the end of the third book of his history.)

Clemens of Alexandria says something similar to this, and corroborates it by the authority of the most ancient teachers, ἀπο των ἀνεκαθεν πρεσβυτερων, who, if we may judge from the substance of their testimony, are very different persons from the former. For it contains, at the same time, the assertion, that the Gospels which contain the genealogies appeared the first, which Eusebius no where found in the works of Papias, or specified in the account of his opinions and assertions, to the contrary of which

Irenæus, the reverer of Papias, deposed. He says, (Euseb. Hist. E. L. vi. c. 14,) "Mark, who had been for a long time in the company of Peter, paid attention to his sermons, wrote them down, and thus composed this Gospel." This likewise, which he adds, is peculiar to him—namely, that Mark composed it at the desire of the believers, and delivered it to them without either the contradiction or the express approbation of the Apostle.

Tertullian writes, in the fourth book against Marcion [f], that it is maintained, concerning the Gospel of Mark, that it properly belonged to Peter, and that Mark was only his interpreter. This information also Origen details [g].

This is then the real signification also of the passage in Justin, in the dialogue with Trypho, where he quotes the words of Mark respecting the sons of Zebedee, who were called the sons of Thunder, with the assurance that it stands ἐν τοις ἀπομνημονευμασιν αὐτου, that is, if we refer this αὐτου to Peter [h]. Christ and Peter are mentioned just before, and this αὐτου might be applied to both; but Justin every where calls the Gospels ἀπομνημονευματα των Ἀποστολων, and in no case ἀπομνημονευματα Χριστου. According to the usual style of Justin's language, the Gospel of Mark consequently is attributed to the Apostle under the title ἀπομνημονευματα αὐτου (Πετρου).

[f] L. iv. c. 5. Licet et Marci quod edidit, Petri affirmetur, cujus interpres Marcus.

[g] Euseb. Hist. E. L. vi. c. 25.

[h] και το ειπειν μετωνομακεναι αὐτον Πετρον ἑνα των Ἀποστολων, και γεγραφθαι ἐν τοις ἀπομνημονευμασιν αὐτου γεγενημενον, και τουτο μετα του και ἀλλους δυο ἀδελφους υιους Ζεβεδαιου ὀντας μετωνομακεναι ὀνοματι του Βοανεργης, ὁ ἐστιν υἱοι βροντης, σημαντικον ἠν του αὐτον ἐκεινον εἰναι. Ed. Rob. Steph. p. 105. c. 106.

SECTION XV.

THE Gospel which Mark wrote was, as we have already hinted, (Section I.) intended for readers who were little acquainted with Palestine and the Jewish manners and customs; whence the author was induced, by annexed illustrations, to explain to those whom he supposed likely to be his readers, many things, which the commonest native of Palestine well knew. But those for whom this work was intended are only superficially pointed out to us by this circumstance. The observation, which he has made in the xiith Chapter, verse 42, chalks out to us more correctly the circle of his readers.

He speaks of the λεπτον, a coin customary in Judæa, and finds it necessary for the instruction of the readers to state its value. His conduct in this particular is worthy of remark; he does not reckon, like Josephus, who in such cases made the valuation in Attic money and specified the value of the shekel by drachmas, but to make himself intelligible to those whom he had in view, he adds, in an observation, the value of the λεπτον according to the species of Roman coins, and thereby points out to those people, to whom the Roman money was more known than any other.

He, contrary to the custom of the Biblical writings, uses the Roman expression Centurio, ὁ κεντυριων, xv. 39., for the commander of sixty or a hundred soldiers. Josephus calls him ἑκατονταρχος, so also is he called in the books of the New Testament; which is a sign, that the ordinary language of Palestine agreed in the use of this expression. Besides, it was vernacular, and the most intelligible to

the Greeks. This deviation from the Jewish and Greek expression can only be in consideration of those readers, who were acquainted with the Latin technical term but strangers to the Greek.

History refers us to Rome itself. Those ancient teachers, οἱ ἀνεκαθεν πρεσβυτεροι, whom Clemens commends, state on the above mentioned passage that Mark had compiled, in a written treatise, the discourses of Peter at Rome, and there published them at the request of the believers[1].

The time likewise, when according to historical data, Mark published his Gospel, fixes its performance in the then capital of the world, and permits us, at least, with regard to its completion and publication, to admit no other place but this.

SECTION XVI.

It is true, that the time in which Mark appeared as a historian, is not unanimously determined by the ancients; yet this indecision only renders the investigation more prolix, but not the reply to the question more uncertain. For, the story has been circulated, that Simon Magus had also tried the fortune of his magic art, in Rome, and acquired divine honours. Justin Martyr is the author of it, and seems to have found the traces of the fact in the well known inscription SEMONI DEO SANCO, the composition of which he has,

[1] This is also confirmed by other authors. Epiphan. Hæres. L. i. ἀκολουθος γενομενος ὁ Μαρκος τῳ ἁγιῳ Πετρῳ ἐν Ῥωμῃ, ἐπιτρεπεται το εὐαγγελιον ἐκθεσθαι, λ. Hieronym. in Catalogo, v. Marcus.—Marcus discipulus et interpres Petri, juxta quod Petrum referentem audierat, rogatus Romæ a fratribus, breve scripsit evangelium etc.

either from its farther contents, or from oral accounts, falsely assigned to the days of the Emperor Claudius[k]. The precipitate decision of this Father of the Church, who was not sufficiently acquainted with the Latin language and the Italian mythology, became the foundation of a still more enlarged report. Peter had once humbled the Magus in another place, and this circumstance now became united with the story of Justin, and thus a whole history arose, in which the dramatis personæ were said to have been Peter and Simon Magus, and its theatre to have been Rome. Chronology, which had to arrange the *spurious* fact in the order of the real occurrences, placed it (according to the time to which Justin had assigned the composition of the inscription) in the reign of Claudius. In this case, Peter must have been, at this time, in Rome, and since circumstances appear more to coincide with it, than at his latter residence there, when he met his death, Mark must have composed his Gospel at that time[l].

False as the date is, yet these accounts which connect the fact of the Gospel of Mark with the fable, *agree, that* Rome was the place at which it was written.

Another account with regard to the Chronology has been given to us by Irenæus, which as far as it relates to Matthew perfectly coincides with that which the contents of the Book (§ 5.) have presented to us on the subject, and therefore is entirely confirmed on this point. This testimony which has a credibility so profoundly investigated informs us thus respecting the Gospel of Mark; "Matthew pub-

[k] Justin's greater Apology. c. 26. p. 144. Ed. Rob. Steph.
[l] Euseb. Chron. ad. A. iii. Claud.

lished his work, when Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, to establish the community of believers, but after their DEPARTURE, (or, *death*,) Mark the scholar and interpreter of Peter, transmitted to us, in a treatise, what the latter had delivered in his discourses [m]." The words μετα τουτων ἐξοδον admit of a double interpretation; Mark published his book after their death, or, after their departure from Rome. Grabe prefers the latter; Valois and others, the former.

This explanation is also the correct one. For, Peter used this expression himself; when he spoke of his death, he called it his ἐξοδος. 2 Pet. i. 14, 15. Irenæus seems here to have had regard to this expression, for the sake of applying the very word of the Apostle to this occurrence.

He says: after the ἐξοδος of the two Apostles, Peter and Paul, who had taught at Rome. If now also, he had supposed (like the later authors) that Peter had been twice at Rome, under Claudius, and afterwards in the last part of Nero's reign, the circumstance of his having united Peter and Paul, their sermon and residence, fully determines his idea, and shows, that he referred to the last days of the Apostles, in which they were together at Rome.

[m] ὁ μεν δε Ματθαιος ἐν τοις Ἑβραιοις τῃ ἰδιᾳ διαλεκτῳ αὐτων και γραφην ἐξηνεγκε του εὐαγγελιου, του Πετρου και του Παυλου ἐν Ῥωμῃ εὐαγγελιζομενων, και θεμελιουντων την ἐκκλησιαν. Μετα δε την τουτων ἐξοδον, Μαρκος, ὁ μαθητης και ἑρμηνευτης Πετρου, και αὐτος τα ὑπο Πετρου κηρυσσομενα ἐγραφως ἡμιν παραδεδωκε. L. iii. adv. Hær. c. 1. Euseb. H. E. L. v. c. 8.

SECTION XVII.

MATTHEW AND MARK.

Further Investigations into their historical sources.

MATTHEW and Mark almost throughout their historical books relate the same events, while, on the contrary, the other Evangelists deviate exceedingly from each other in the choice of them, and also differ from these in a striking manner. It is therefore justly demanded: whence arises this conformity between Matthew and Mark? Why have they, out of the great number of facts which lay before them, chosen precisely the same? With profane authors, who had such an extensive field of history before them, we should, by such an appearance, easily be brought to suspect, that the one had before him the writings of the other, while he was at his labour. But if they being unanimous in this point in their historical representation and terms, similarly narrate, (as it is often the case with these authors) their facts in just as many sentences and clauses, with the same expressions in the order and position of the words, even down to the adverbs and conjunctions; this would certainly be a clear proof that they did not write independently of each other, but that the later author had followed and made use of the earlier, or that they very closely drew their materials from a third common document.

So long as we can consider these historians merely as authors, whose value is not supposititious, but who as yet are under enquiry, and whose merit is still the subject of a critical investigation, this judgment upon them is valid[n]. And, in fact, their similarity is often greater than we usually find between two authors, as the following examples will prove.

I.

Matt. xv. 32.	Mark viii. 1.
προσκαλεσαμενος τους μαθητας	προσκαλεσαμενος τους μαθητας
αὐτου, εἰπεν αὐτοις,	αὐτου, λεγει αὐτοις,
σπλαγχνιζομαι ἐπι τον ὀχλον,	σπλαγχνιζομαι ἐπι τον ὀχλον,
ὁτι ἡδη ἡμερας τρεις	ὁτι ἡδη ἡμερας τρεις
προσμενουσι μοι	προσμενουσι μοι
και οὐκ ἐχουσι τι φαγωσι.	και οὐκ ἐχουσι τι φαγωσι.
. . . . .	. . . . .
και ἐκελευσε τοις ὀχλοις	και παρηγγειλε τῳ ὀχλῳ
ἀναπεσειν ἐπι την γην	ἀναπεσειν ἐπι της γης
και λαβων τους ἑπτα ἀρτους,	και λαβων τους ἑπτα ἀρτους,
. . . . εὐχαριστησας	εὐχαριστησας
ἐκλασε και ἐδωκει	ἐκλασε και ἐδιδου
τοις μαθηταις αὐτου·	τοις μαθηταις αὐτου
οἱ δε μαθηται	ἱνα παραθωσι, και παρεθηκαν
τῳ ὀχλῳ,	τῳ ὀχλῳ,
και ἐφαγον παντες, και ἐχορτασθησαν,	ἐφαγον δε, και ἐχορτασθησαν,
και ἠραν το περισσευον	και ἠραν περισσευματα
των κλασματων	των κλασματων
ἑπτα σπυριδας.	ἑπτα σπυριδας.

[n] As it is yet a question, whether these books contain historical value, we naturally cannot estimate the inspiration, which can only be proved from them, when we have decided upon that point. Theologians also are agreed, that a style and a mode of writing are peculiar to these sacred authors; under which supposition they bring proofs, from the style and genius, for the age and genuineness of the Biblical writings.

II.

Matt. xiii. 4.

καὶ ἐν τῷ σπειρειν αὐτον,
ἁ μεν ἐπεσε παρα την ὁδον,
καὶ ἠλθε τα πετεινα,
καὶ κατεφαγεν αὐτα.
ἀλλα δε ἐπεσεν ἐπι
τα πετρωδη
ὁπου οὐκ εἰχε γην πολλην,
καὶ εὐθεως ἐξανετειλε,
δια το μη ἐχειν βαθος γης·
ἡλιου δε ἀνατειλαντος,
ἐκαυματισθη
καὶ δια το μη ἐχειν ῥιζαν,
ἐξηρανθη.
ἀλλα δε ἐπεσεν ἐπι τας
ἀκανθας,
καὶ ἀπεπνιξαν αὐτα.

καὶ ἀλλα ἐπεσεν ἐπι
την γην την καλην,
καὶ ἐδιδου καρπον.

v. 20.

ὁ δε ἐπι τα πετρωδη
σπαρεις,
οὑτος ἐστιν, ὁ τον λογον ἀκουων,
καὶ εὐθυς μετα χαρας
λαμβανων αὐτον,
οὐκ ἐχει ῥιζαν δε ἐν ἑαυτῳ,
ἀλλα προσκαιρος ἐστιν·
γενομενης δε θλιψεως,
ἡ διωγμου δια τον λογον,
εὐθυς σκανδαλιζεται·
ὁ δε εἰς τας
ἀκανθας σπαρεις,
οὑτος ἐστιν ὁ τον λογον ἀκουων,
καὶ αἱ μεριμναι του αἰωνος,
καὶ ἡ ἀπατη του πλουτου

συμπνιγει τον λογον,
καὶ ἀκαρπος γινεται.

Mark iv. 4.

καὶ ἐγενετο ἐν τῷ σπειρειν,
ὁ μεν ἐπεσε παρα την ὁδον,
καὶ ἠλθε τα πετεινα,
καὶ κατεφαγεν αὐτο.
ἀλλο δε ἐπεσεν ἐπι
το πετρωδες
ὁπου οὐκ εἰχε γην πολλην,
καὶ εὐθεως ἐξανετειλε,
δια το μη ἐχειν βαθος γης·
ἡλιου δε ἀνατειλαντος
ἐκαυματισθη
καὶ δια το μη ἐχειν ῥιζαν,
ἐξηρανθη.
ἀλλο δε ἐπεσεν ἐπι τας
ἀκανθας,
καὶ συνεπνιξαν αὐτο,
καὶ καρπον οὐκ ἐδωκε.
καὶ ἀλλο ἐπεσεν εἰς
την γην την καλην,
καὶ ἐδιδου καρπον.

v. 16.

καὶ οὑτοι . . . ἐπι τα πετρωδη
σπειρομενοι,
οἱ ὁταν ἀκουσωσι τον λογον,
εὐθεως μετα χαρας
λαμβανουσιν αὐτον,
καὶ οὐκ ἐχουσι ῥιζαν ἐν ἑαυτοις,
ἀλλα προσκαιροι εἰσιν·
εἰτα γενομενης θλιψεως,
ἡ διωγμου δια τον λογον,
εὐθεως σκανδαλιζονται·
καὶ οὑτοι εἰσι εἰς τας
ἀκανθας σπειρομενοι,
οἱ τον λογον ἀκουοντες,
καὶ αἱ μεριμναι του αἰωνος,
καὶ ἡ ἀπατη του πλουτου,
καὶ αἱ περι τα λοιπα ἐπιθυμιαι,
εἰσπορευομεναι
συμπνιγουσι τον λογον,
καὶ ἀκαρπος γινεται.

III.

Matt. xxvi. 47.	Mark xiv. 43.
και ἐτι αὐτου λαλουντος,	και εὐθεως ἐτι αὐτου λαλουντος, παραγινεται
Ἰουδας, εἱς των δωδεκα, ἠλθε,	Ἰουδας, εἱς των δωδεκα,
ται μετ' αὐτου ὀχλος πολυς, μετα μαχαιρων και ξυλων	και μετ' αὐτου ὀχλος πολυς, μετα μαχαιρων και ξυλων
ἀπο των Ἀρχιερεων, ται Πρεσβυτερων του λαου.	παρα των Ἀρχιερεων, και των Γραμματεων, και των Πρεσβυτερων.
ὁ δε παραδιδους αὐτον ἐδωκεν αὐτοις σημειον, λεγων, ὀν ἀν φιλησω αὐτος ἐστιν, κρατησατε αὐτον.	δεδωκει δε ὁ παραδιδους αὐτον συσσημον αὐτοις, λεγων, ὀν ἀν φιλησω αὐτος ἐστιν, κρατησατε αὐτον, και ἀπαγαγετε ἀσφαλως.
και εὐθεως προσελθων Ἰησου, εἰπε, χαιρε, Ῥαββι, και κατεφιλησεν αὐτον.	και ἐλθων, εὐθεως προσελθων αὐτῳ, λεγει, χαιρε, Ῥαββι, και κατεφιλησεν αὐτον.

IV.

Matt. xxiv. 32.	Mark xiii. 28.
ἀπο δε της συκης μαθετε την παραβολην. ὀταν ἠδη κλαδος αὐτης γενηται ἀπαλος, και τα φυλλα ἐκφυῃ, ινωσκετε, ὀτι ἐγγυς το θερος. οὐτω και ὑμεις, ὀταν ἰδητε παντα ταυτα, γινωσκετε, ὀτι ἐγγυς ἐστιν ἐπι θυραις. ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν, ὐ μη παρελθῃ ἡ γενεα αὐτη, ἑως ἀν παντα ταυτα γενηται. ρανος και ἡ γη παρελευσονται, οἱ δε λογοι μου οὐ μη παρελθωσι.	ἀπο δε της συκης μαθετε την παραβολην. ὀταν αὐτης ἠδη ὁ κλαδος ἀπαλος γενηται, και ἐκφυῃ τα φυλλα, γινωσκετε, ὀτι ἐγγυς το θερος· οὐτω και ὑμεις, ὀταν ταυτα ἰδητε γενομενα, γινωσκετε, ὀτι ἐγγυς ἐστιν ἐπι θυραις. ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν, ὀτι οὐ μη παρελθῃ ἡ γενεα αὐτη, μεχρις οὐ παντα ταυτα γενηται. ὁ οὐρανος και ἡ γη παρελευσονται, οἱ δε λογοι μου οὐ μη παρελθωσι.

Who would ascribe such a similarity as this to mere accident? for although it does not prevail throughout, these are not the only passages which might be cited in proof of it. Or, how could any one, with such extracts from profane writers placed before him, doubt that the one had borrowed from the other, the later from his predecessor?

SECTION XVIII.

But, *might* not both of them have made use of the same sources, and might not this be the cause of their similarity? At all events, where such a phenomenon occurs, this is the second case that may be supposed. Perhaps both of them had an Hebrew history of Jesus, and from that composed their works. Formerly the report prevailed, that such an Hebrew original document had existed, our books have the appearance of translations from an Hebrew document,—their similarity and the difference in expression which often exists between them, as well as their deviations of other descriptions, may thence be explained and elucidated, and many passages may thence be put in such a light, that we are tempted to account this hypothesis as more than an hypothesis.

In fact, very recent essays upon the Evangelists* have so polished and adorned this, that we should become extremely prepossessed in its favour, did not certain difficulties remain, which, on account of their apparent insignificance, were not brought for-

* Eichhorn, General Library of Biblical Literature, vol. v. chapters 5 & 6.

wards, but which nevertheless are decisively demonstrative of the contrary.

If Matthew and Mark had translated out of one common Hebrew document, their works in many places could not have been so uniform even to the most minute incidental harmony of expression.

1. In the rich abundance of the Greek language there was more than one expression analogous to the generality of Hebrew words: consequently they might be far more different from each other. Let us consider the second passage, which has been cited in proof of their similarity, Matth. xiii. 4. Mark iv. 4. and refer to Luke, who likewise is said to have followed this common original document, that we may perceive, how variously, even in the most simple sentences, the expression might distinguish them from each other: και ἀνεβησαν αἱ ἀκανθαι και ἀνεπνιξαν αὐτο, Luke renders it, viii. 7. και συμφυεισαι αἱ ἀκανθαι ἀπεπνιξαν αὐτο. *Matt. Mark.* ἀλλα δε ἐπεσεν ἐπι την γην την καλην. *Luke.* και ἑτερον ἐπεσε εἰς την γην την ἀγαθην. *Matt. Mark.* δια το μη ἐχειν βαθος γης. *Luke.* δια το μη ἐχειν ἱκμαδα. *Matt. Mark.* ἀλλα δε ἐπεσεν ἐπι τα πετρωδη. *Luke.* και ἑτερον ἐπεσε ἐπι την πετραν.

2. If we compare the structure of the Hebrew, Chaldaic, or Syriac language with that of the Greek, such a [p] similarity must be totally inexplicable. The first have only two tenses, a past and a future, and partially, a sign for the preterpluperfect, while, on the contrary, the Greek has two future tenses of

[p] This argument must not be indiscriminately admitted, for it is evident, that Hug knows little of the force of oriental particles.—*Translator.*

common occurrence in the New Testament and in the past, it has an imperfect, a first and second aorist in the active voice, and just as many tenses in the middle voice, which it applies to the same use.

To render a past time of the Hebrew or Syriac into Greek, there are therefore often about eight—and to render the future, in very many cases, four possible methods.

Whence did it then arise, that, where they agree in expression, they for the most part also agree in their use of the same tense in the Greek, for the original writing could not induce them to have done so? Let us consider the passages already adduced: instead of, προσκαλεσαμενος τους μαθητας αὐτου, or קרא תלמידיהו they might likewise have placed προσκαλεσας, προσκαλων: instead of השכיב על הארץ ἀναπεσειν ἐπι της γης, they might have also placed ἀνεπεσαι, ἀναπεσεσθαι, ἀναπεσασθαι, or ἀναπιπτειν and ἀναπιπτεσθαι, for λαβων, they might as well have used εἰληφως, λαβομενος, λαμβανων; for εὐχαριστησας also, εὐχαριστων, εὐχαριστησαμενος, etc. In the same manner in the third example, for λαλουντος—λαλουμενου, λαλησαντος, λαλησαμενου —for κρατησατε—κρατειτε, κρατησασθε might be used. Notwithstanding the numerous future tenses of the Greeks, the New Testament contains sometimes one even peculiar to itself through an extraordinary use of the language, which is formed by means of the conjunctive mood. Glassii Philol. s. P. 1. ed. Dathii, p. 313. Moreover, when Matthew permitted to himself the use of this grammatical anomaly, it appears, in the same place in Mark, as, for instance, we may perceive under number iv. where, instead of οὐ μη παρελευσεται is written οὐ μη παρελθῃ ἡ γενεα, and instead of οἱ λογοι μου οὐ μη παρελθουσι or παρελευσονται οὐ μη παρελθωσι, occurs.

3. It is known that the Syrian, Jew, &c. have no verbs compounded with adverbs, while the Greek on account of the compositions with *συν, μετα, ἐπι, παρα, κατα, εἰς, προς*, &c. possesses a superfluity of expression. The Greek does not always of necessity use these, but merely avails himself of them to create a greater precision of his language, of which a multitude is provided for this selection, often merely for variation. For this purpose the Syrian and the Jew have, generally speaking, nothing, and it is very seldom that such a signification is contained in the root, as, for instance, in יצא *he is gone out* עלה *he is gone up*. But if, at the same time, (as this is not a very usual instance) a reason for the use of such a compound word appears from the connection, the copiousness of the Greek language still occasions a liberty and choice. We may use for קרא תלמידיהו *προκαλεσαμενος τους μαθητας* — *συγκαλειν, μετακαλειν, κατακαλειν*; for *προσμενουσι* — *περιμενουσι, παραμενουσι, συμμενουσι, καταμενουσι*· Αἱ *μεριμναι συμπνιγουσι τον λογον* might also be rendered by *ἀποπνιγουσι, κατα-πνιγουσι, ἐμπνιγουσι*. Both Evangelists, therefore, frequently used their compound words superfluously; in the passage adduced, for instance, in *προσελθων κατεφιλησεν αὐτον* the composition was so needless, that Luke contents himself with *του φιλησαι αὐτον*, for *εὐθυς ἐξανετειλε, δια το μη ἐχειν βαθος*, the word *ἀνετειλε* was quite sufficient. Of this sort also is the following example:

Matt. xx. 25.	Mark x. 42.
οἰδατε ὁτι οἱ ἀρχοντες των ἐθνων, κατακυριευουσιν αὐτων και οἱ μεγαλοι κατεξουσιαζουσιν αὐτων.	*οἰδατε ὁτι οἱ δοκουντες ἀρχειν των ἐθνων κατακυριευουσιν αὐτων και οἱ μεγαλοι αὐτων κατεξουσιαζουσιν αὐτων.*

Here the compound κατακυριευουσιν was very unnecessary, and not required by the Hebrew; Luke places simply κυριευουσιν. This is also the case with κατεξουσιαζουσιν, which Luke expresses by ἐξουσιαζουσιν; for, ἐπικυριευουσι and ἀνακυριευουσι were just as much to the purpose, as well as ἐπεξουσιαζουσι or the real expression αὐτεξουσιαζουσι.

4. The Orientals have no adjectives derived from substantives [1]. If therefore the Evangelists made use of such, they were not led to them by the Hebrew, but this was the translator's own licence. And yet they agree with each other in the use of them. They inform us that the Baptist had a ζωνην ΔΕΡΜΑΤΙΝΗΝ περι την ὀσφυν αὐτου; this word cannot be translated by the Syrian or the Arab in any other way than by a substantive, they were thus forced to change it into ܥܒܝܐ ܕܟܦܐ, جلد جَلْدَة, ζωνη δερματος. They could only render ἀγναφος by a circumlocution or by ܚܕܬܐ καινος, Matt. ix. 16. Mark ii. 21. For Ἀτιμος, Matt. xiii. 57. Mark vi. 4. Luke substitutes οὐ δεκτος, and John iv. 44, τιμην ουχ ἐχει. Let us consider the second passage cited above, where several of them occur: ἐπι τα πετρωδη: here Luke uses ἐπι την πετραν, and thus must it have stood in the original, as the Syrian might express it by ܠܐ ܗܢܘܢ Ἀλλα προσκαιροι εἰσι; Luke says προς καιρον, and thus also the Oriental translator أنا وإصا إنمي. Ἄκαρποι γινονται, for this the Oriental has no equivalent adjective; he therefore writes ولا ثمر فيهم—ولا هاذا ولا.

We even find that in one passage they agree very unexpectedly in the use of the same dialect: for,

[1] This has some exception as far as regards the Arabian translator, who says, انساني و الهي, &c.

both express themselves in it in the Æolic, Matt. xxvi. 69. Mark xvi. 68., και συ ἠσθα μετα Ἰησου. κ. τ. λ.

Such a frequent agreement between two authors in so many instances, in which, the genius of the language in which they translated afforded to them numerous possibilities of choosing different expressions, and in which the language from which they translated did not lead them to any agreement, cannot be explained by a common original text, as the model after which it happened.

5. The citations from the Old Testament (of which we have already seen proofs in Section xii.) are treated in our copies of Matthew with much freedom, and yet with much knowledge of the subject, which is characteristic of him. In this also Mark is not at variance with his predecessor. Matth. xi. 10. differs from the LXX. in the citation from Malachi iii. 1. ἰδου ἐξαποστελλω τον ἀγγελον μου και ἐπιβλεψεται ὁδον προ προσωπου μου, and has translated it with a more pointed reference to the office and mission of the Baptist; ἰδου ἀποστελλω τον ἀγγελον μου προ προσωπου σου, ὃς κατασκευασει την ὁδον σου ἐμπροσθεν σου. Mark quoted it precisely in the same manner, (c. i. 2.) and ascribed the words to Isaiah, whence we see that he did not derive them from the prophet himself.

The words of Isaiah xxix. 13. (on which something has been said, Sect. xii.) are, it is true, taken by Matthew xv. 8. 9. out of the LXX.: but they are cited from memory, whence they obtained a singular appearance, both as to position and inflexion. The Apostle says: ὁ λαος οὑτος τοις χειλεσι με τιμᾳ, ἡ δε καρδια αὐτων πορρω ἀπεχει ἀπ' ἐμου· ματην σεβονται με διδασκοντες διδασκαλιας ἐνταλματα ἀνθρωπων; the LXX. place τιμωσι με instead of με τιμᾳ, and represented the last words thus; ματην σεβονται με, διδασκοντες ἐνταλματα ἀνθρωπων και διδασκαλιας. In the same manner, as

Matthew now cites the LXX, from memory, Mark (vii. 6. 7.) has also quoted them with the same deviations and with the same freedom.

Matthew xxvi. 31: has either himself translated the words of Zachariah xiii. 7. or his memory has not faithfully referred to them from the LXX. yet Mark xiv. 27. agrees with him. That he forsook the LXX. in the passages, where Matthew forsook them, that he translated them, as he did, or that he adduces the passages with exactly the same deviations as Matthew, is not an accidental circumstance; but the reason of it *is to* be sought elsewhere than in the Hebrew *Bible*.

These phœnomena cannot leave us undecided in rejecting at once the idea of an original Hebrew document being the common source, to which they, for the most part, verbally adhered. One must have had the other before his eyes, the latter the former, and therefore, according to the history, Mark must have had Matthew before his eyes, and that too in the Greek language.

SECTION XIX.

So far has the disputed question varied, since these investigations, respecting the Gospels, first appeared. We have in general receded from the opinion, that the first three Gospels were nothing more than translations from a Hebrew original document, which, in the course of time, obtained here and there several additions, whence it is said to have happened that the Evangelists, as one of them had obtained a copy of it, became dissimilar as to the number of the facts or their circumstances, &c. Whilst their

dissimilarity thence was explained, this explanation was contradicted by their inexplicable agreement in words and expressions in many places.

Of this a learned Englishman in particular has convinced himself by a comparison of several English translations, which were made from the same text of the Gospels. Experience showed to him how little such a conformity takes place between the several translators even in the most simple sentences.

On that account, however, he did not give up the idea of an original Hebrew copy; but endeavoured to support it by a subsidiary hypothesis. The original Hebrew Gospel, as he proposes it to us, was soon after its publication translated by somebody into Greek, and this translation was before the eyes of our Evangelists in those passages, where they literally agree with each other.

Yet, this scholar perceived that a single Greek translation was not sufficient to explain all the phœnomena. For, either all three literally agree and had a common translation of such parts before them; or two only, to the exclusion of the third, agree in the expression, and had a translation of these parts, which remained unknown to the third, and from the use of which he was excluded. This might be the case in three different ways: either Matthew and Mark, or Matthew and Luke, or Luke and Mark did thus agree, where they might have had occasion for a peculiar translation of the passages in question, from which they borrowed the expression. To avoid, however, all this detail, he availed himself of an ingenious idea respecting Matthew, which rendered all these particular translations unnecessary. But let us ourselves hear in what condensed brevity he comprizes his ideas upon the subject.

"All three Evangelists (such are his words) Matthew, Mark, and Luke used copies of the common original Hebrew document ℵ. Matthew preserved its materials, which he wrote in the Hebrew, in the language, in which he found them; but Mark and Luke translated them into Greek. Neither had a knowledge of the other's Gospel; but, Mark and Luke made use of a Greek translation of it, (besides their copies of the Hebrew original document ℵ), which had been made, ere any of the interpolations α—β—&c. was inserted. Lastly, since the Gospels of Mark and Luke contain Greek translations of the Hebrew materials, which were incorporated into the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, the person, who translated the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew into Greek, frequently availed himself of the assistance of the Gospel of Mark, where this had matter in common with Matthew, and in those places, and in those alone, in which Mark had nothing in common with Matthew, he frequently had recourse to the Gospel of Luke[1]."

This proposition, as it is here represented, clears up all the phœnomena with regard to the literal conformity of the Evangelists: and possesses, therefore, the recommendation of not being defective on this point. But he premises an unsubstantiated position as its basis, namely, that the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Hebrew;—and exacts, independently

[1] Herbert Marsh's remarks and additions to J. D. Michaelis's Introduction to the Sacred Writings of the New Testament, translated from the English, by E. F. K. Rosenmüller. Götting. 1803. V. ii. P. 284.

The preceding is a retranslation from the German, the translator not having the means of consulting the original, in the part of the country, where he was employed on this volume.

of this supposition, the hypothesis of a Hebrew original Gospel—besides which, he exacts a second, namely, that a Greek translation of it was extant; to say nothing of a Hebrew Gnomonology, which he also requires.

The suspicious appearance of the first assertion, with respect to Matthew, did not escape the celebrated German scholar, who, for the sake of avoiding it and yet preserving the leading idea of an original Gospel, preferred accommodating himself to a proposition which was very complicated and full of hypotheses,—which may be divided nearly into the following heads.

I. There was, before the composition of our three first Gospels, a Hebrew original Gospel in circulation. This was early translated into Greek, and was the source in those cases, where all three Evangelists coincide in expression [t].

II. But where only Matthew and Mark agree in words, a copy of the original Gospel is the basis, which was already enriched with some additions, of which moreover a Greek version existed, of which the two Evangelists availed themselves to facilitate their literary undertaking [u].

III. But where Matthew and Luke agree in the narrative and also accord in the words, other Hebrew additions are the basis, which had been annexed to the original Gospel by some other learned

[t] J. Gottfr. Eichhorn, Introduction to the N. T. 1 vol. Leipz. 1804. §. 45—55. and §. 182.

[u] Idem. §. 67. p. 319, 320

hand, and of which there also existed a Greek translation, which they consulted, and from whence their literal harmony may be explained [x].

From these three Hebrew and three Greek records, constituting in all six works, our Evangelists have consequently made three. However profuse the German scholar has otherwise been, in creating records and sources, yet his proposition has the defect of leaving one phœnomenon unexplained, although it is the first requisite to a hypothesis, that it be sufficient to explain all phœnomena, which have a relation to it. He has not thought that instance worthy of consideration, in which, Luke and Mark, to the exclusion of Matthew, verbally agree, which is sometimes observable, as the examples prove, which are cited in Section 36 [y]. Indeed it does not happen very often; but in this case it does not depend upon the question, *how often?* And even if there were only the two last passages among the examples which have been adduced in the above-mentioned Section, there would still exist too much similarity to be ascribed to mere chance, and we should be therefore obliged, again to assume from hence, the existence of another, and consequently a fourth translation, or admit, that one of the two Evangelists had the other before him and extracted these passages from him. However, there are few very considerable passages, but for the most part only detached sentences, in which this agreement is observed, from which, it cannot at all be supposed, that a Greek translation of them was composed. If this then be the case, we might even be necessitated

[x] J. Gottfr. Eichhorn, Introduction to the N. T. 1 vol. Leipz. 1804. §. 77—83. p. 344—351.

[y] Idem. §. 37. p. 38—40.

from these appearances to return to the proposition, that the latter of the Evangelists had obtained a sight of the composition of the former.

A scholar has lately made the following propositions to unite these hypotheses[*];

1. There existed a Hebrew or Syro-chaldaic original Gospel for the use of the preachers of the faith in Palestine, from which Matthew composed his in the same language.

2. This original Gospel was, when they began to communicate, the doctrines (of Christianity) to other lands, translated into Greek and enriched with several additions.

3. From the latter Mark and Luke composed their books, whence an agreement, as to facts and expressions, arose in parts of their mutual treatises.

4. Also Matthew was translated into Greek, in the execution of which, the translator used the writings of Mark for the sake of the expression, and produced the striking similarity of words, which has often been noticed.

5. Sometimes also he interpolated Matthew from the book of Mark, whence has arisen a similarity between them as to matter, in places, where Luke differs from them.

6. But where Matthew and Luke, to the exclusion of Mark, agree, it was effected by subsequent

[*] Gratz's New Essay to explain the Origin of the first Three Gospels. Tübing. 1812.

interpolations; since these passages were transcribed from Matthew into Luke.

7. In those places where the original Gospel has no particular additions, they all three agree in matter, and for the reasons given in No. 2, and 4, harmonize also in words.

The peculiarity of this view, viz. the scheme of the interpolations, enabled the author to reduce the number of the records, of which Eichhorn's idea stands so much in need.

SECTION XX.

Besides each of these hypotheses not being a single hypothesis, but a collection of many, of which the second does not even explain the whole, and the third, as we will show in the sequel, has its internal weaknesses—there are objections against them collectively, which as yet have not been answered. *The first* set of hypotheses, arranged under five heads, regards the original Gospel.—It never existed.

1. As a work of history, for the purpose of making known to the people of Palestine what Jesus had done, the writing was for a very long time to no purpose. It could not possibly tell them so much as they had seen themselves, and as much as for many years afterwards, a number of eye-witnesses knew and related to them.

2. For what purpose could it then be? for the supply of what necessity was it then composed?

There was a necessity, is the answer, for a written reference for the preachers of the faith, that unity might be attained in points of doctrine and in discourses. Well: but upon the same principle that the publication of a historical book for the people was unnecessary, so the history was not taught even orally, as long as the unanimous voice of contemporaries declared it in Palestine. The mode of teaching adopted by the Apostles was, as we shall show by facts in the illustrations of the Proœmium to Luke, to take the history of our Lord as a thing known and acknowledged, and to unite inferences or doctrines with the accounts which the common voice preserved; chiefly also to compare passages of the Old Testament, for the sake of proving, that all which was spoken in the Prophets respecting the Messiah, was realized in Jesus.

For, not even in foreign lands, since the Apostles did not long continue in one place, (as, for instance, Paul at Corinth and Ephesus,) could any one enter upon a regular narrative of the fortunes and actions of Jesus.

3. The application of the prophetical passages must consequently have been the chief object in such a plan of instruction; on which account it would be necessary to write down the occurrences, with which these passages were to be united.

But for this purpose neither was there at first a previous writing; nor was one composed in the sequel. Long before there could have existed a written reference for those purposes, it was, (as we perceive from Acts iv. 24—30.,) the opinion of the whole school, that the events in the life of Jesus

Not long after the resurrection of our Lord, Peter, at the Pentecost, took occasion, in consequence of the charge of intoxication, ingeniously to turn the subject to the illustration of the times of the Messiah, and from thence to Jesus, as the Messiah, whose predicted death and resurrection he established from the Old Testament, (Acts ii. 14—42.) and of which he convinced three thousand persons. As yet there was not even a plan of operation, much less a book of instruction: even the first attempt of the quick-thoughted speaker, much as he may have recommended himself in the sequel, did not lead to a preparation of this description. His observation upon the DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF THE MESSIAH from Ps. xvi.has not passed into the original Gospel; for Matthew, who had made it his task to carry these comparisons throughout his whole book, did not find it there: nor did one of the other Evangelists.

We leave the following speeches of Peter untouched, but we must make mention of that of Philip. He explains, without hesitation or preparation, to the Eunuch of Candace the words of Isaiah *liii. 7.* as relating to Jesus the Messiah, Acts viii. *32—36.* Yet, significantly as this passage of the Prophet pourtrays the deportment of Jesus in suffering and death, it has not entered into any one of our Books, which are supposed to have flowed from the original Gospel.

If ever a previous book of instruction had been composed with regard to the application of prophetical passages, it must have been formed from the first and most successful attempts to convert the chiefs and principal speakers of the school. This however did not take place, as examples already cited prove. Mark has only a few prophetical collations in the whole of his book, and Luke has still

fewer, yet they could not have avoided them, if they had compiled their labours from an original Gospel thus formed.

4. An original Gospel, an archetype, a prototype, or whatever else we may please to call the fictitious book, is farther contradicted by history. Those Cyprians and Cyrenians who were driven by flight to Antioch taught and founded a Church there without being furnished with a book, as far as we are able to judge. Acts xi. 21, 22. If they were able to do this without such a manual, why should not also the eye witnesses of the history and those who were fully empowered to teach?

Paul, together with Barnabas, had already past through the southern parts of Asia Minor without being acquainted with a writing of this sort. Not until he had returned a long time from this journey, did he confer with the Apostles at Jerusalem, respecting his doctrinal views, that he might not indiscreetly toil and labour, Galat. ii. 1, 2. Barnabas, his fellow-teacher and companion, was therefore also unacquainted with any extant book of instruction, although he was sent by the Apostles with full authority and power to teach, and give directions to the Church at Antioch, Acts xi. 22. and although he, during a year, with the assistance of Paul, had instructed that congregation*. How then can we suppose the existence of a manual for the use of the Apostolic Mission, with which Paul and Barnabas, when they preached the Christian doctrines to the Church of Antioch and afterwards, after having tra-

* If the deputies to the Apostles at Antioch had no original book given to them, neither had they any Greek translation of it, as some allege to us respecting the Church of Antioch. Graz's New Essay to explain the origin of the Gospels, § 27. p. 108. 9.

versed many countries of Asia Minor, as teachers, for more than twenty years after the death of our Lord, were not acquainted?

Thus it is evident, that Paul depended on no such a book, but that he had made particular inquiries into the history of our Lord, and was possessed of accounts, which we seek in vain from others. Let us observe the fine principle of our Master, Acts xx. 35. then the words of the last supper, 1 Corinth. xi. 24. 27. in which Luke follows him, xxii. 19, 20. and his remarkable enquiries respecting the fact of the resurrection, 1 Corinth. xiv. 5—7 [b].

5. If for upwards of twenty years after the death of Jesus no written plan of instruction had been communicated to those who were sent to make known the Christian doctrines, it must, if ever one existed, have been projected afterwards. But then it was certainly not made either in the Hebrew or the Aramaic language, as it is supposed. Of what further use for this purpose then was a Hebrew doctrinal work, when the commission was completed in Palestine and its environs, and when the Greeks were by this time believers?

But, on the other hand, we meet with Hebrew phrases, from which it is said to be evident, that our Evangelists translated from the Hebrew. Certainly there are passages, in which, however agreeing on the whole, they differ from each other in a single word or a small sentence; in which the one chooses this and the other another expression. Thus, as we in such like cases, call to mind the equivalent Hebrew or Ara-

[b] If we would call the memoranda, which Paul possessed, respecting the life and doctrine of Jesus, *his Gospel*, it may be allowed to pass; but his collections and the original Gospel, as it is called, have no connection with each other.

maic word, it becomes obvious how each thought of his expression; as, for instance, to choose the simplest example, how Matthew calls the servant of the Centurion, παις, and Luke, δουλος: because נער signifies both in Hebrew [c].

But such a thing could only occur through the intervention of a Hebrew book. It happened to them as it happens to us, when we have to speak or write a living language, which we have only imperfectly learned. The Hebrews and Aramæans thought, in their native language, that which they wished to express in a foreign; they formed the sentence in their thoughts, Hebraically, they read it likewise in their mind Hebraically, and *then* united the Greek words, for the sake of expressing it in Greek. Now it could not fail that the one found the not exactly synonymous expression, the second, the more synonymous one, or at least that he believed that he had found it.

The whole proceeds from common Hebraisms, which the one has, and the other attempted to avoid. But where we extend it farther and where we wish to explain all verbal differences in the same manner, the forced and distorted begins. Among the known explanations of this sort, how many are there very simple, striking and satisfactory? But if they even had these qualities, and if their number, in general, were even greater, then would their capability of proof be that of induction, and would rest on a following syllogism. We know, from examples, that

[c] This argument is not exactly pertinent, for there are several instances in Greek, in which παις is equivalent to δουλος, is, therefore, no reason to suppose נער rather than עבד to have been the Hebrew word. If those, who wrote the Gospels, were Jews *ab origine*, it is natural to suppose that their *native* Jewish term would in every case have an influence on the idiom of their Greek.—*Translator.*

where between our authors small deviations in expression take place, as soon as we imagine the passage in Hebrew or Aramaic, it directly becomes plain how the one and the other thought of his expression. But the multitude of phœnomena of this sort is so great, that it can neither be ascribed to chance, nor, on our part, to the play of imagination. We are therefore referred to an Hebrew original text as a source, which is the foundation of the three Gospels.

This is the real representation of the proof, which was intended by such attempts. As long as it does not appear very clear with the arguments of the major and the middle proposition; as long as there are so few examples, and still fewer of good examples, we may regard the proof of the Induction as a debt, which indeed is acknowledged but not paid, and probably never will be paid. Who could explain from the Hebrew, how Matthew xii. 28. could translate, *εν πνευματι Θεου*; Luke xi. 20. *εν δακτυλῳ Θεου*; how Matthew vii. 11. *δωσει αγαθα*; Luke xi. 13. *δωσει πνευμα αγιον*; or how Matthew vi. 26. *πετεινα του ουρανου*: Luke xii. 24. *τους κορακας*? can we mistake רוח for אצבע? רוח הקדש for טבות? or שמים עוף for ערבים? We will cite only some few more instances of this sort. Matth. x. 29. *δυο στρουθια ασσαριου πωλειται*: Luke xii. 6. *πεντε στρουθια ασσαριων δυο πωλειται*; Matth. (*ib*^{m}.) *ου πεσειται επι την γην*; Luke (*ib*^{m}.) *ουκ εστιν επιλελησμενον*; Matth. xxiii. 23. *το κυμινον*; Luke xi. 42. *παν λαχανον*; Matth. xxiii. 13. *κλειετε την βασιλειαν των ουρανων*; Luke vi. 21. *ηρατε την κλειδα της γνωσεως*; Matth. v. 48. *τελειοι*; Luke vi. 36. *οικτιρμονες*; Matth. v. 4. *οτι αυτοι παρακληθησονται*; Luke vi. 21. *οτι γελασετε*. What is in each instance the Hebrew word, from which these variations could have proceeded, like two different translations?

6. For the sake of giving some support to the hypothesis of an original Hebrew Gospel, of which there were various copies and translations, from whence our Gospels are said to have been taken, a prop was subjoined to it, which has in itself no strength; namely, the subsidiary hypothesis, that no one of the Evangelists had obtained a sight of the writings of his predecessor, and been able to use them as a foundation.

What obstacle, then, was there? Did they perhaps all three at the same time suddenly conceive the idea of writing works, and did they complete them at one and the same time? Such an assertion as this did not enter the thoughts of even one of those, who invented the modern schemes. But if our historians published their works at different times, would not the book of the first have become known to the subsequent writer?

If Luke knew MANY OTHERS, whom he notices in his proœmium; why should he not then have known his fellow-labourers? Had they indeed mutually so estranged themselves from each other, as to break the social bands between them, at the very moment that they were endeavouring to uphold and diffuse the same communion?

If they sojourned in Christian Asia or in the recently converted Europe, they were in the Roman Empire; not far from the bosom of the Mediterranean Sea, the central point of all circulation and commerce. Or, did not Rome maintain any connection with the two capital cities of its Asiatic possessions, with Ephesus and Antioch? And were they not also both capital cities of Christianity? Was not Corinth the theatre of all commerce and business? Did not the Asiatic ships sail to the Macedonian ports, and the Macedonian to the Asiatic?

Had the Phœnicians ceased to navigate the sea? Were not the Alexandrian ships seen in the harbours of Asia and Italy? Rome was then the great place of resort, in which subjects from all parts of the world sought justice, transacted business, carried on their affairs, and exchanged the most costly articles of trade. We must then invent in favour of this hypothesis an entirely different world from that which then existed; or we must assert, that the Christians wilfully renounced all social connections and wished to know nothing of each other [d].

SECTION XXI.

It is nevertheless insisted upon, that no one had seen the earlier writings of the other, and proofs of the assertion are offered to us. They say, as to the verbal agreement of the first three Gospels, that two alternatives are possible; either one had seen and used the writings of the other; or they have in these instances mutually extracted from a third or more sources. Then they proceed:—if the first of these alternatives be not conceivable, then the second must be admitted, with all those combinations by which it is possible to explain, even in a more extensive point of view, every phœnomenon in regard to language and expression.

But on what principle is the first alternative not conceivable? They differ (they say) in circumstances from each other, they frequently do not

[d] Dr. Vogel pays attention to difficulties of this sort, in his paper, on the Origin of the first Three Gospels in Gabler's Journal for Select Theological Literature, vol. i. part 1. p. 11—25.

agree among themselves in the arrangement and situation of events, and in chronological definitions: they are also at actual variance with each other in essential points of difference, which give quite another form to the events and discourses, or, they are likewise so, in discrepancies, which border upon contradiction, which could not be the case, if the one had seen the other. Sometimes also the one relates things more circumstantially, where the other is more concise, in which case also he must have disdained the better inquiries of the other, if we suppose him to have seen him *.

Of this sort, are the proofs, from which it is said to be evident, that all the postulates, which have been made for the solution of the given problem, are correct and indispensable. Let us for once put them to the test upon two different authors; let us suppose ourselves for a moment uncertain, respecting all that relates to their connection with each other. Let them be the historians, Livy and Polybius. We would now directly prove, that, Livy did not see Polybius, and on the other hand, that Polybius was not acquainted with Livy. The one is sometimes at variance with the other respecting the circumstances of events; they also differ from each other respecting the chronology of some facts; they are embarrassed by differences which border upon contradiction: the one also sometimes declares the contrary of the other, and lastly, the one and the other have not always made proper use of the more

* Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament. vol. i. § 39—45. He had as a predecessor, Dr. Herbert Marsh, in his Observations and Additions to J. D. Michaelis's Introduction to the N. T. p. 245. Germ. Translation. With his customary perspicuity, Bertholdt has treated this proof in his Histor. Crit. Introduction to the Writings of the O. and N. T. part iii. § 312—319.

extensive detail, which they individually might find in the works of each other. Therefore, neither was acquainted with the other: Livy was not acquainted with Polybius, nor Polybius with Livy. Is this then true? is it perfectly correct? And yet Livy refers to Polybius by name in several books of his history.

Therefore a historian might have read his competitor upon the same subject and yet not have renounced his own judgment, he might give authority to his own researches, and endeavour to surpass the earlier author by means of farther investigations: he might have read him and yet have comprehended many circumstances differently; he might have preferred another order in chronology, and arranged the facts according to other references. He might have read him and nevertheless differ from him, he might have read him and nevertheless venture to entertain a different opinion. He might sometimes express himself more briefly, because he had read him and found the subject exhausted. This we may presume has never been doubted by any man. Yet no one in the most modern works has paid attention to this observation.

Why then do we refuse to apply that to the composers of the Gospels, which is acknowledged to be true and valid in profane authors?

Why should not one, who had the work of another before him, presume to differ from him? Does the reason of it lie beyond their power, or in their opinion? There exists respecting it no external necessity or prohibition:—therefore, merely peculiar views of their circumstances, or a certain agreement between them must have imposed this constraint upon them.

This however would not be fair, and would even

be a principle, in which no good author would participate with them. To begin with such a presumption concerning the office of investigating the sources and the value of that which was prepared for an historian, would certainly not be the proper mode. We can only have recourse to assertions of this sort when we arrive at the end and termination of the whole investigation, where it were even bad enough to find such a result.

Yet, we sometimes fall into the notion on which the conduct of later critics rests; of extracting in one place a passage from Matthew; in another, one from Mark or Luke, and of then drawing the inference from their differences; that neither of them had seen the book of the other; since otherwise he could not have varied from him.

Or, as we are left on this head in utter uncertainty, and are obliged merely to guess, do we mean to imply so far by this assertion? as that Mark could not have varied from Matthew in such a passage, nor Luke from Mark, &c., because the account of the one is the more minute. Whence, where we are just conceiving the idea of entering on an inquiry into their historical merit, did we arrive at this previous knowledge? That therefore is again equivalent to a commencement by a thing, of which we can have no knowledge, until we arrive at the end of it.

Nothing of the sort can be asserted *in limine* with certainty from single passages or detached sentences, as there may exist different causes for deviation, with which we are not acquainted collectively, until we have obtained a decided information respecting the conduct and habits of each of these authors, both as far as it may relate to themselves and by means of collation. But for this purpose it

is necessary to discover the design of each of these works, and to consider not only the whole number but also the scope of the branches of the narrative, and to comprehend each individual mode of treatment in the representation and execution, and the peculiarities which occur. If all this has taken place, we are then qualified to pronounce which of these works has the greatest similarity to a first attempt; which aspires to a stricter chronology, and representation of circumstances; which adds to these a treasure that has not been used by the others, and which is the most advanced in the perfection of the history. Then, we may decide with certainty, that the one could not have failed to have availed himself of the other, if he had read him. But to admit decisions, which precede investigations, as truths, and then to introduce them as proofs into the inquiries, may avail in any thing but in an impartial solution of a proposition.

SECTION XXII.

The course of the investigation now conducts us back from universals to particulars, it leads us again to Matthew and to the question,—Had he an original Gospel, or did he copy or translate several Hebrew and Greek books? Or did the individual, who is known to have been an eye-witness, write down his own observations and deliver them, as well as he could, in one work?—IS MATTHEW AN ORIGINAL AUTHOR?

If the existence of any preceding biography of our Lord could be made probable, it would not yet be proved, that Matthew had used it as a source;

we should be still much less authorized to presuppose this, for, this would be, as if we were forced to doubt,—WHETHER THE EYE-WITNESS HIMSELF BE A SOURCE IN THE HISTORY, WHICH HE DETAILS.

We do not really know what to say about such a doubt; formerly they probably thus thought, on the subject. The appearances of the sensible world, as far as they are considered as such, rest on the evidence of sense, and where our own perception is not within the boundary of that which appears, we resort to the sense of *the third person*, knowing that the observation of him, who perceives it, is the highest proof of the existence of that, which is perceptible. From this principle it was conceived that the highest law of historical criticism proceeded: where I am not myself present in the theatre of events, and do not receive the impressions of them by means of my own faculty of perception, it is the observation of the spectator to which I am referred, to arrive at the knowledge of it:—it is the eye-witness, and with him ceases all farther investigation into historical phœnomena, so far as they are only considered as such. Where then Matthew is an eye-witness, he must also be the source.

But there are some few facts in his book, from which history excludes him: in all they are only two, of which he was not a spectator, since his admission as an apostle; viz. the transfiguration on the Mount and the occurrence in the house of Jairus. Otherwise he was μετα των δωδεκα, and knew as much as any one of the twelve that, which had happened in Galilee, to which his history is even exclusively confined, with the exception of the history of the passion, the scene of which was in Jerusalem, where however he, as well as the other Apostles, resided at the time.

This indeed might show, that he is a source, since his book contains nothing, at which he was not himself present, or to which he was not near; and that he does not pass beyond the limits of Galilee his native land, leaving unnoticed the events in Judæa which lay at a great distance from his station.

II. If in the Memorabilia of Socrates, any one would search for a farther source, and then as an ingenious result of his investigations would support the assertion, that Xenophon had already found these Memorabilia in existence and that he, therefore, had the merit of adding something to them in expression; or, also, according to another hypothesis, that he had compiled them from detached and dispersed accounts; how would such an assertion be received? He was a scholar of the celebrated teacher, whom Socrates met and united to himself, as Jesus did Matthew. From this time forward until a few hours before he drank the poisoned cup, he was an eye witness of his actions, his companion and friend. If then he relates to us the circumstances of the life of his teacher from this epoch, we must have grounds for imputing to him a perfect inability for such a composition, if we would refer, with any justice, his narrative to any other source.

The case is the same with the scholar of Jesus; we must be able to prove, that he had not the capability for this work. But which of the twelve had more talent from his station and vocation, for a written composition, than he? Had not the portitor and the farmer of the state-tolls, who was placed by his employments in every sort of intercourse with the world, more ability and more practice to write a work of this description, than fishermen and the like?

Or does the composition display traces of a higher cultivation, than we could expect from him? Does it presuppose a great knowledge of the world, great taste and talents for a classical production? And yet throughout his whole history, there prevails (with the exception of some Jewish learning) the tone of an unlearned man ignorant of the historical art: a poverty of language without a knowledge of its grammatical peculiarities, and the thoroughly blunt unpretending communication of a common person, who, on account of his situation, had learned to read and write.

Now, how can we be justified in passing over the eye-witness, who is competent in each point of view, in so inconsiderately departing from the narrator, who is himself a source, for the purpose of creating independently of him, a source, which in and by itself, with all its qualities, lies in the empire of fiction!

SECTION XXIII.

Yet it is supposed, that some notices of some such earlier or original Gospel are found; and indeed, in the works of Justin Martyr[1]. Since, in this manner, the citations of this Father of the Church have come in connection with the investigation of the sources of the first three Gospels, we must indeed make up our mind to indulge in some remarks upon them in this place.

[1] J. Severin Vater has made a critical enquiry into the Books which are proposed as sources of our Gospels: de Evangelüs quæ ante Evangelia canonica in usû Ecclesiæ Christianæ fuisse dicuntur. Regiomont, 1812, 4to: to which I the rather refer, as this learned man has deemed all the hypotheses worthy of his well known penetration, with which I, in concordance with my plan, cannot intermeddle.

Justin is accustomed to demonstrate the whole of Christianity from the Old Testament. In the dialogue with Trypho the Jew, whom he wishes to convert, he refers, in general, to Moses and the Prophets for the occurrences of the new covenant, as if they were all previously predicted in them, and then recounts the facts detailed in the New Testament, for the sake of comparing them together freely and without bias in their own words. But with regard to the Prophets, where it decidedly depended upon the expression, to which the Jew adhered, which he weighed, and in the explanation of which he certainly used other evasions, he dared not to proceed thus. In the one case, the phrase or word had to determine it: in the other the matter, independently of the individual expression of the historian. He acts thus, also, in the greater Apology. He wishes to show the Roman people, that all which concerned Jesus and his history, was predicted in the prophets, and enters into circumstantial explanations of these oracles of the Jews. For he, as well as his scholar Tatian, had an idea, that all the knowledge of Thales, Socrates, Plato, and of the ancient philosophers, was only borrowed from Moses and the sacred books of the Jews, which they endeavoured to instil into the Greeks and the Romans, by means of their own writings; the first, in the λογος παραινετικος προς Ελληνας, the other in a discourse which he merely entituled προς Ελληνας. But he represented the doctrines of Christianity and the history of its founder in that part of the Apology, which related to it, according to his own style of narrative, and frequently, in a purer phraseology, without binding himself strictly to the expression of the historical books.

We shall be perfectly convinced of the licence,

which he took in citing the New Testament, if we compare such passages together as occur twice in his work. In the 17th chapter of the Dialogue with Trypho, he cites thus;—γεγραπται . . . . . ουαι υμιν, Γραμματεις, και Φαρισαιοι, Ὑποκριται· ὁτι ἀποδεκατουτε το ἡδυοσμιον, και το πηγανον, την δε ἀγαπην του Θεου και την κρισιν οὐ κατανοειτε. Ταφοι κεκονιαμμενοι, ἐξωθεν φαινομενοι ὡραιοι, ἐσωθεν δε γεμοντες ὀστεων νεκρων. Και τοις Γραμματευσιν, ουαι υμιν Γραμματεις, ὁτι τας κλεῖς ἐχετε, και αὐτοι οὐκ εἰσερχεσθε, και τους εἰσερχομενους κωλυετε, ὁδηγοι τυφλοι.

In the same book, at the 112th chapter, he introduces also these words down to ὁδηγοι τυφλοι:—ἐφη ὁ ἡμετερος Κυριος, ... ταφοι κεκονιαμμενοι, ἐξωθεν φαινομενοι ὡραιοι, και ἐσωθεν γεμοντες ὀστεων νεκρων, το ἡδυοσμον ἀποδεκατουντες, την δε καμηλον καταπινοντες, τυφλοι ὁδηγοι.

In the 35th chapter of this Dialogue he also quotes, εἰπε . . . . . ἀναστησονται πολλοι Ψευδοχριστοι και Ψευδο-ἀποστολοι, και πολλους των πιστων πλανησουσι, but in the 82nd chapter,—εἰπε . . . . . ὁτι Ψευδοπροφηται και Ψευδοχριστοι πολλοι ἐπι τῳ ὀνοματι μου παρελευσονται, και πολλους πλανησουσι.

In the greater Apology, at the 16th chapter,—πολλοι ἐρουσι μοι, Κυριε, Κυριε, οὐ τῳ σῳ ὀνοματι ἐφαγομεν, και ἐπιομεν, και δυναμεις ἐποιησαμεν; και τοτε ἐρω αὐτοις, ἀποχωρειτε ἀπ' ἐμου, ἐργαται της ἀνομιας.

In the Dialogue, at the 76th chapter,—πολλοι ἐρουσι μοι· Κυριε, Κυριε, ἐν τῳ σῳ ὀνοματι ἐφαγομεν, και ἐπιομεν, και προεφητευσαμεν, και δαιμονια ἐξεβαλομεν· και ἐρω αὐτοις, ἀποχωρειτε ἀπ' ἐμου.

In the Apology, at the 15th chapter,—και τον ἡλιον αὐτον ἀνατελλει ἐπι ἁμαρτωλους και δικαιους και πονηρους.

In the Dialogue, at the 96th chapter, he again calls God,—τον, τον ἡλιον αὐτου ἀνατελλοντα ἐπι ἀχαριστους και δικαιους, και βρεχοντα ἐπι ὁσιους και πονηρους.

In the Apology, at the 16th chapter,—*καὶ προσελθοντος αὐτου τινος, καὶ ὑποντος, διδασκαλε ἀγαθε, ἀπεκρινατο λεγων, οὐδεις ἀγαθος, εἰ μη μονος ὁ Θεος ὁ ποιησας τα παντα.*

In the Dialogue, at the 101st chapter,—*λεγοντος αὐτῳ τινος, διδασκαλε ἀγαθε, ἀπεκρινατο, τι με λεγεις ἀγαθον, εἰς ἐστιν ἀγαθος, ὁ πατηρ μου, ὁ ἐν τοις οὐρανοις.*

The passages here enumerated suffice as a proof, that Justin, in his writings, and in one and the same writing, was not invariably uniform in his quotations from the New Testament; that for the sake of being less restrained in his expressions he has often merely confined himself to the sense, and exhibited it with references to solitary words; that he has connected many sentences and arranged them sometimes in one and sometimes in another order, at pleasure or according to his views.

He who wishes to see a more copious example of his very free mode of relation may find it in the sequel in the supplement on the authenticity of the two first chapters of Matthew. (§ 64.)

If we then put together these quotations, presupposing them to have been literally printed, if we overlook the circumstance of their difference from each other, and propose that among them which has the most unrestrained manner, as the real text: if we then add the assurance, that they were all taken from merely one single book, and unite them with each other, as such, by this procedure, a book is certainly produced, which closely resembles, frequently this, and frequently that of our first three Gospels, and is actually like to neither of them.

To this book, which has been thus fortunately discovered, some have confidently given the priority, and thence have proved, that the quotations of Justin

even where they verbally agree with one of our Gospels, were not taken from them; but that our Evangelists necessarily borrowed from this more ancient book,—from this original Gospel, those sentences and passages, in which a similarity of matter and expression is observed between them and the book of Justin. This is nearly the process, by which they have arrived at this discovery: of this sort are the strict critical principles, by which their correctness is placed beyond doubt.

Whether we must then acknowledge as a principle the position to which all of it comes at last—the position that Justin has always strictly and verbally cited his memorials of Jesus,—the passages which have been already collated may decide. How then the case stands respecting the whole series of conclusions thence deduced needs no farther illustration.

Here we might rest, and consider the matter to be decided, as far as we are obliged to treat it polemically: yet many may probably desire some further observations, which may include the refutation which is required.

Justin also calls his sources, from which he has extracted the acts and doctrines of Jesus, ἀπομνημονευματα, from a partiality which he is well known to have transfused into his writings, from the Platonic school to which he formerly belonged. He should indeed have called them ἀπομνημονευματα Χριστου, as Xenophon's ἀπομνημονευματα of the person, who is the subject of the historical book, were entitled, ἀπομνημονευματα Σωκρατους. But the Martyr derives their name from the authors, who composed them and always calls them ἀπομνημονευματα των Ἀποστολων: he explains himself upon this point in the eighty-eighth chapter of the Dialogue ὡς περιστεραν το ἁγιον πνευμα ἐπεπτηναι ἐπ' αὐτον, ἐγραψαν

οἱ Ἀποστολοι αὐτου του Χριστου ἡμων. He evidently here recognizes more than one author.

He also, instead of this expression, makes use of the term Gospel in the singular number; "*it is written in* THE GOSPEL:" and as his opponent expresses himself in the Dialogue: "*it is in that, which is called* THE GOSPEL." ἐν τῳ εὐαγγελιῳ γεγραπται· —ἐν τῳ λεγομενῳ εὐαγγελιῳ. ch. 10th and 100th. But perhaps he speaks after the colloquial custom of the teachers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, who considered the works of the four Evangelists merely as one Gospel, which indeed is different as far as it regards the authors, but not as it regards the subject, and on this acccount it may be simply ἐν εὐαγγελιον δια τετταρων, or a τετραμοφρον εὐαγγελιον ἐν ἑνι πνευματι, quadriforme Evangelium in uno spiritu, etc. Compare Part i. § 47.

In another place, he has explained himself more distinctly upon this matter: for, in the greater Apology he speaks of the Gospels in the plural number, (ch. 67th.) οἱ Ἀποστολοι ἐν τοις γενομενοις ὑπο αὐτων ἀπομνημονευμασι, ἁ καλειται εὐαγγελια, οὑτως παρεδωκαν. As the expression, τα εὐαγγελια, "*the Gospels*," was never used either in the antient or modern Christian world, when mention was only made of one book, so is it here determinate, and the Martyr was not only acquainted with several authors, but also with several books of this name.

The phrase ἀπομνημονευματα των ἀποστολων occurs about fourteen times in the citations of Justin. He has on one occasion made a remarkable exception, where he mentions the change of Peter's name, and the children of Zebedee; this, says he, is written in his (viz. Peter's) commentaries, ἐν τοις ἀπομνημονευμασιν ἀυτου. He had already before made mention of Peter's change of name, (Dial. chap. 100), but merely

referred respecting it simply to the ἀπομνημονευματα των Ἀποστολων, in which the occurrence is related, that Jesus affixed the name of Peter to Simon, after he had acknowledged him to be the Son of God. But when he also mentions the sons of Zebedee, who were called the children of thunder, he changes the citation, and observes, "it occurs in his, (Peter's) memoirs." Dial. chap. 106.

He then strikingly distinguishes the memoirs of Peter from those of other Apostles, and as we have already observed, Section 14, the account of the children of Thunder is only to be found in Mark, whose book the ancients, with regard to the historical investigations peculiar to him, entirely referred to Peter.

Among his citations, yet another case is found, in which he particularly explains his mode of citation. He indeed refers again to the ἀπομνημονευματα, but extends farther the adjunct, Ἀποστολων, which he always adds; and even says "they are composed by the Apostles and by ἐκεινους παρακολουθησαντων, their companions in the ministry, ἐν γαρ τοις ἀπομνημονευμασιν, ἃ φημι ὑπο των Ἀποστολων αὐτου και των ἐκεινους παρακολουθησαντων συντεταχθαι, ὁτι ἱδρως ὡσει θρομβοι κατεχειτο αὐτου εὐχομενου. λ." Who then are the παρακολουθησαντες?

On this point antiquity does not leave us in any difficulty. Mark is the ἀκολουθος, ἑρμηνευς, or *sectator Petri:* Luke also according to the antients is an ἀκολουθος, *comes, sectator Apostoli.* Thus what Justin says of the records, that they were written by Apostles and their companions, exactly harmonizes with our Gospels. And now it still deserves a particular consideration, that in this passage, in which Justin adds the explanation, that the ἀπομνημονευματα

were not only composed by Apostles, but also by their companions, he quotes a passage from one of these companions, viz. from Luke, ἱδρως ὡσει θρομβοι κατεχειτο αὐτου εὐχομενου xxii. 44. Dial. ch. 103.

The ἀπομνημονευματα are therefore not by one individual; but there are more Gospels written by Apostles and companions of the Apostles, as it is the case with ours. Where Justin speaks of the memoirs of Peter, he cites Mark; where he speaks of the companions of the Apostles, with reference to these memoirs, he quotes a passage of Luke. We shall however again discover Matthew in his other citations.

SECTION XXIV.

We may then quietly return to our old assertion: that Matthew is the original, and that Mark wrote after Matthew! but the particular plan and the intentions of the latter, the manner in which he availed himself of his predecessor, we can only distinguish in the course of the investigations. They both agree in the choice of the occurrences, and for the most part in their order, and in expressions, and also in dividing the actions of Jesus, which they have inserted after the return from the temptation, into *four* journies, which he, exclusively of the last journey which ended in his Passion, undertook from the place of his residence into different countries. We will examine the solutions, to which a more minute consideration of this will lead us.

THE FIRST JOURNEY.

MATTHEW.	MARK.
	I. Jesus goes into the synagogue at Capernaum, and cures a Dæmoniac.
I. Jesus cures a leper, with the injunction to tell no one of it.	
II. He meets the centurion, whose servant he cures.	
III. He goes into the house of Peter.	II. He goes into the house of Peter.
	III. He cures a leper, with the injunction to tell no one of it.
IV. One individual is desirous of following Jesus and is sent back.	
V. Jesus goes into the land of the Gadarenes; cures Dæmoniacs, and returns.	
ἠλθεν εἰς την ἰδιαν πολιν.	παλιν εἰσηλθεν εἰς Καπερναουμ.
Matt. ix. 1.	Mark ii. 1.

THE SECOND JOURNEY.

MATTHEW.	MARK.
I. Four men bring one sick of the palsy.	I. Four men bring one sick of the palsy.
II. Jesus calls Matthew.	II. Jesus calls Matthew.
III. The disciples of John fast; the disciples of Jesus do not.	III. The disciples of John fast; the disciples of Jesus do not.
IV. Jesus cures the daughter of Jairus and the woman afflicted with a flux. (γυνη αἱμορῤῥουσα.)	
V. Jesus chooses his disciples and sends them away.	
VI. John sends his disciples to enquire of Jesus.	
VII. Jesus goes with his disciples through the corn.	IV. Jesus goes with his disciples through the corn.
Και μεταβας ἐκειθεν, ἠλθεν εἰς την συναγωγην αὐτων.	Και εἰσηλθε παλιν εἰς την συναγωγην.
Matt. xii. 9.	Mark iii. 1.

THE THIRD JOURNEY.

MATTHEW.	MARK.
I. A man with a withered hand is cured.	I. A man with a withered hand is cured.
	II. Jesus chooses his disciples.
II. Jesus is said to perform cures through Beelzebub.	III. Jesus is said to perform cures through Beelzebub.
III. They demand a sign.	
IV. The mother and brethren of Jesus come to him.	IV. The mother and brethren of Jesus come to him.
V. Jesus teaches in Parables.	V. Jesus teaches in Parables.
	VI. Jesus comes into the land of the Gadarenes, and cures a Dæmoniac.
	VII. Jesus cures the daughter of Jairus.
ἐλθων εἰς την πατριδα αὐτου.	ἠλθεν εἰς την πατριδα.
Matt. xiii. 54.	Mark vi. 1.

The difference between Mark and Matthew in these three Journies arises chiefly from the classification of that into the land of the Gadarenes, which Matthew has placed at the end of the first excursion, but Mark at the end of the third. Let us take it out of the order in Matthew and assign it to the place which Mark has given to it; let us then put aside the facts II. and IV. in Matthew, which Mark has omitted without assigning to them another place in his book, and thus the first excursion will become uniform.

In the second Journey, they agree until the events in Matthew IV. V. VI. The difference again partly arises from the journey to Gadaris. For, in both is the story of the daughter of Jairus so arranged, that it must have happened not long after this journey. Since Matthew has transferred it to the end of the first journey, Mark to the end of the third, so the occurrence, which followed soon after this journey, obtained in Mark another place. Respecting the enquiry of the disciples of John, Mark is entirely silent. Let us now arrange the relation of Matthew in No. V. a little further in the third journey, and a perfect uniformity exists between them.

THE FOURTH JOURNEY.

MATTHEW.	MARK.
I. The Prophet is without honour in his native country.	I. The Prophet is without honour in his native country.

MATTHEW.	MARK.
	II. Jesus sends forth his disciples.
II. Herod believes that John has risen.	III. Herod believes that John has risen.
	IV. The disciples of Jesus return from their mission.
III. Five thousand are fed.	V. Five thousand are fed.
IV. Jesus walks upon the sea, appears thereon to the Apostles, and comes to Gennesareth.	VI. Jesus walks upon the sea, appears thereon to the Apostles, and comes to Gennesareth.
V. The Disciples of Jesus eat with unwashed hands.	VII. The Disciples of Jesus eat with unwashed hands.
VI. Jesus comes to the neighbourhood of Tyre: the history of the woman of Canaan.	VIII. Jesus comes to the neighbourhood of Tyre: the history of the woman of Canaan.
VII. Four thousand are fed.	IX. Four thousand are fed.
VIII. They demand from Jesus a sign.	X. They demand from Jesus a sign.
IX. The Apostles for-	XI. The Apostles for-

MATTHEW.	MARK.
get to take bread with them.	get to take bread with them.
	XII. A blind man is presented to Jesus on the road to Bethsaida.
X. Jesus asks, whom do they account him?	XIII. Jesus asks, whom do they account him?
XI. The transfiguration on the Mount.	XIV. The transfiguration on the Mount.
XII. The Apostles cannot cure a Dæmoniac.	XV. The Apostles cannot cure a Dæmoniac.
ἐλθοντων δε αὐτων εἰς Καπερναουμ. Matt. xvii. 24.	Και ἠλθεν εἰς Καπερναουμ. Mark ix. 33.

In this journey Mark differs from Matthew in this respect, that he separates the occurrence of the Mission of the Disciples, (which Matthew mentions, when he informs us in the second journey, No. 5. of their election,) from that circumstance, and represents it as an independent event, and afterwards, particularly informs us, after an intermediate space, of their return and actions:—Matthew seems also to have united these occurrences more on account of their relationship, than according to the succession in point of time. Besides, Matthew has twice related the fact, respecting those who demanded a sign, here, and in the third journey, No. iii.—

Mark has omitted it the first time, and only mentioned it here. The occurrence in No. xii. is independently of Matthew peculiar to him.

Thus far they are similar up to the history of the passion, which now begins in both histories. When Jesus quitted Capernaum this time, he went to meet his death.

SECTION XXV.

WHENCE, then has Mark thus freely treated the order of facts in his predecessor, and arranged several things in a different manner? An object and a cause must have occasioned this procedure; as it could not have been but intentionally, that an occurrence was removed from its place and joined to a more distant connection.

Whence, for instance, could it happen, that he has separated from each other the election of the Apostles and their mission to the world which, in Matthew, are united, and distinguished them as two facts, the last of which he represents in quite a different connection, if he did not wish to observe their natural order and to arrange them, as they took place?

He behaves in this case with still more precision; a part of the discourse which, according to Matthew, Jesus here spoke to his disciples, he separates from the rest, and only inserts it, where Jesus before his death revealed to his disciples the prospects respecting their future fate. The passage is the following:

MATT. x. 19.	MARK XIII. 11.
ὁταν δε παραδιδωσιν ὑμας,	*ὁταν δε αγαγωσιν ὑμας παραδιδοντες,*
μη μεριμνησητε	*μη προμεριμνατε*

Matth. x. 19.	Mark xiii. 11.
πως ἡ τι λαλησητε,	τι λαλησητε,
	μηδε μελετατε,
δοθησεται γαρ ὑμιν,	αλλ' ὁ ἐαν δοθῃ ὑμιν,
ἐν ἐκεινῃ τῃ ὡρᾳ,	ἐν ἐκεινῃ τῃ ὡρᾳ,
τουτο λαλειτε,	τουτο λαλειτε,
οὐ γαρ ὑμεις ἐστε, οἱ λαλουντες,	οὐ γαρ ἐστε ὑμεις, οἱ λαλουντες,
ἀλλα το πνευμα του πατρος ὑμων,	ἀλλα το πνευμα το ἁγιον,
το λαλουν ἐν ὑμιν.	
παραδωσει δε ἀδελφος ἀδελφον	παραδωσει δε ἀδελφος ἀδελφον
εἰς θανατον,	εἰς θανατον,
και πατηρ τεκνον,	και πατηρ τεκνον,
και ἐπαναστησονται τεκνα	και ἐπαναστησονται τεκνα
ἐπι γονεις,	ἐπι γονεις,
και θανατωσουσιν αὐτους,	και θανατωσουσιν αὐτους,
και ἐσεσθε μισουμενοι	και ἐσεσθε μισουμενοι
ὑπο παντων δια το ὀνομα μου,	ὑπο παντων δια το ὀνομα μου,
ὁ δε ὑπομεινας εἰς τελος,	ὁ δε ὑπομεινας εἰς τελος,
οὑτος σωθησεται.	οὑτος σωθησεται.

We see that on both sides it is the same account, and exactly the same phraseology. What could induce Mark to detach these words from their connection in Matthew and to arrange them differently, if it were not for the sake of assigning to them their proper place? Considered as to their subject, they certainly stand in Mark in a more appropriate connection, than they were in Matthew.

Since he has taken detached sentences from the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, and united them with other occasions, events, and discourses, (for instance, Matt. vi. 14. Mark xi. 25, 26. Matt. v. 15. Mark iv. 21. Matt. v. 13. Mark ix. 50. Matt. vii. 2. Mark iv. 24.) we cannot better explain this attention and care in placing detached sentences of the Sermon on the Mount elsewhere, than from his intention of relating every thing in its order, as it occurred, since Matthew, on the contrary, has at the commencement of Jesus's office, as a preacher, united in

one brief system of religious doctrines, whatever our Lord might have spoken under the most different circumstances.

We observe manifestly this object of the author in the journey to Gadaris, as well as in other cases. Matthew has mentioned it at the end of the first journey, and Mark has transferred it as far as the conclusion of the third. He joins to the fact the proper statement of time, whence it is evident that it was his object to detail the regular order of events. Jesus taught in parables on the sea shore, where he was surrounded by a great concourse of people, Mark iv. 1. After the conclusion of this parabolical discourse, he adds that the passage across the sea to Gadaris, took place ἐν ἐκεινῃ τῃ ἡμερᾳ ὀψιας γενομενης· Mark iv. 35, on the same day towards the evening. It is indeed true that the expression ἐν ἐκεινῃ τῃ ἡμερᾳ contains in the Evangelists an indefinite relation to time; but the accompanying observation on the division of the day itself, ὀψια, shows, that the passage must be accepted, as a strict definition of time. The circumstance, therefore, which has been previously noticed in the fact, that they conducted Jesus away from the crowd and conveyed him into a ship, iv. 36. corroborates the connection of the passage with the occurrence which immediately precedes it, viz. with the parabolical instruction which Jesus had given to the crowd by the sea.

In the second journey Matthew after the journey to Gadaris, and after some intermediate events, recounts without any determination of time, the cure of the daughter of Jairus and that of the woman with the flux. ix. 18. Mark, who has removed these to the end of the third excursion, distinguishes the fact according to time and relation, and maintains their immediate connection with the journey to Gadaris

by the assurance, that at the time when they had landed on their return, the father of the child had come to Jesus, &c. v. 21, 22.

We hence perceive, that he has taken the natural succession of the events as a model for the plan of his history, and that in the distribution of facts, he has treated of them according to the occasions of their occurrence.

SECTION XXVI.

His manner of treating the individual occurrences again distinguishes him from his predecessor: he is almost universally more circumstantial in those particulars with which each fact is attended. By this minuteness and attention to minor points his narrative becomes more detailed and more clearly representative of the events. Matthew informs us, for instance, of the history of the woman afflicted with the flux more in a summary notice, than in a proper narrative: "*a woman, who during twelve years had been afflicted with a flux, approached from behind and touched his garment; for she thought, if I may but touch him, I shall be cured. Jesus turned himself round, saw her, and said,—Be of good cheer, daughter, thy faith hath recovered thee.*"—Mark, on the contrary, is attentive to the most minute circumstances. The state and suffering of the invalid were more nearly known to him; during twelve years all the art of the physicians was lavished on her in vain; she had expended much of her property, and her sufferings visibly increased, a circumstance which uncommonly raises the miracle of the speedy performance of her cure, and the benevolence displayed

in it. She heard of Jesus, approached him from behind in the crowd, and touched his garment, from the conviction that she should be cured. The Lord felt that virtue had gone out from him, turned himself round, and said—"Who hath touched me?" The disciples in reply assured him of the impossibility of designating the individual among such a crowd of people. But Jesus looked round, and his look fell upon the person who had touched him, who was already conscious of the effect, and instantly falling upon her knees before him with fear and trembling, confessed all, as it had happened. Jesus replied to her; "Daughter, thy faith effected thy cure."

In this manner, more or less, he has not paraphrased the greater part of the occurrences, but invested them with the particular circumstances, under which they took place: for instance,—

Mark i. 40.—ii.	Matt. viii. 2—5.
Mark ii. 2—13.	Matt. ix. 2—9.
Mark iv. 35.—v.	Matt. viii. 23—28.
Mark v. 1—20.	Matt. viii. 28.—ix.
Mark vi. 14—30.	Matt. xiv. 6—13.
Mark xii. 28—35.	Matt. xxii. 34—41., &c. &c.

It is worthy of remark, what a knowledge he had of the persons who occur in this history and of their circumstances. Where Matthew ix. 18. contents himself with ἀρχων, we perceive in Mark his name, JAIRUS, and his rank εἰς των ἀρχισυναγωγων; v. 22. where Matthew (xv. 22.) names in general terms a γυνη Χαναναια, Mark knows the particulars respecting her: ἡν δε ἡ γυνη Ἑλληνις, Συροφοινικισσα τῳ γενει. vii. 26. Matt. xxvii. 16. simply designates Barabbas as δεσμιον ἐπισημον; Mark xv. 7. knows his crime,

ἐν τῃ στασει φονον. The first only mentions a Cyrenian called Simon, xxvii. 32. Mark informs us xv. 21. that it was Simon the Cyrenian, the father of Alexander and Rufus; the first xxvii. 57. speaks of a rich man, Joseph of Arimathea: the other is acquainted with him, as an important member of the council, xv. 43—45. and was aware of the conversation between him and Pilate, and how the Prætor called the Centurion to an account. He adds the circumstance respecting the Magdalene, xvi. 9. ἀφ' ἧς ἐκβεβληκει ἑπτα δαιμονια, and we shall instantly meet again with an instance of the like sort respecting the blind man on the road near Jericho, x. 46.

There is yet one example more of the minutiæ known to this author. They had, according to Matthew xvi. 5. forgot to take bread with them; yet says Mark viii. 14. they had one loaf with them in the ship. It also is to be remarked, that at the incident at Gadaris, he observes, v. 13. that there were about two thousand swine.

He therefore has not copied from Matthew but arranged him, he has represented with more precision his historical narrative, which frequently only gives the outline of a fact, heedless of the concomitant circumstances and their details, and he has made these sketches of Matthew into a full history. He is not the epitomizer, as some have occasionally said, after Augustin, but the recensor of Matthew, and his recension is so rigid, that he appears to have positively contradicted him.

Where Matthew mentions two Dæmoniacs at Gadaris, Mark v. 2. only speaks of one. Where Matthew, xx. 30., speaks of two blind persons cured on the road to Jericho, Mark only mentions one, x. 46., and it is plain, that both their narratives refer to the same fact, as well on account of the time, as

of the similarity of the circumstances and of expressions, in which they harmonize. Mark has here even strikingly substantiated his assertion by adducing a proof, from which it seems clear, that he is fully informed: for, he mentions the man by name, on whom the cure was effected, and adds it in two languages, in the Greek and Syriac, *υἱος Τιμαιου, Βαρτιμαιος ὁ τυφλος.*

These, however, are real contradictions, if we are ignorant of Matthew's object; but if we weigh his ultimate views, they merely arose from an indifference about things, which had no connection with his purpose: (Sect. 4). He only wished to show from the actions of Jesus, that he was the Messiah, with which plan, a perfectly exact chronology was not consistent. None of the minuter circumstances were suited to this purpose;—he found enough in the outline of an occurrence, from which to deduce his proof, from which cause, he proceeds so summarily in his writings, that it is evident, that he did not wish to occupy himself with accessory circumstances. It is therefore neither occasioned by want of insight, nor of sincerity and love of truth;—and it is only the want of the one or of the other, but not the indifference towards things which do not belong to a proposed plan, which make an author guilty of mistake and untruth.

SECTION XXVII.

The guarantee and source to which history has referred us, and by the aid of which Mark has furnished us with so many new and important observations on Matthew are distinctly demonstrated in his

work. In the first alteration, which he began to effect in the classification of some of our Lord's actions, viz. where he excluded from its order the history of the Centurion, and arranged the cure of the Leper, which Matthew had mentioned earlier, directly after the visit to Peter's house, he added immediately before this last fact, the account that Simon was also with Jesus at that time. Mark i. 36. και κατεδιωξαν αυτον ὁ Σιμων και οἱ μετ' αὐτου. Where he gives the history of the daughter of Jairus in a manner remarkably more circumstantial; he again expressly adds the circumstance, that he had only admitted as witnesses to the whole occurrence Peter, John, and James, v. 37. Matt. xxi. 18., relates to us the history of a withered fig-tree; Mark xi. 12—15. and 20—27. details it to us more copiously, uniting with it some instructive discourses, and by name, a part of the Sermon on the Mount. Matt. vi. 14, 15. He seems by this again to substantiate his account, and exhibits to us Peter, of whom Matthew is silent, as the person who caused the Dialogue and the adjoined instructions. Mark xiii. 3., mentions, among the persons who were the speakers at the conversation respecting the last fate of the temple and the holy city, particularly the name of Peter, where Matthew, xxiv. 3., has stopped merely at generals, without specifying the persons, who were the speakers. Matthew xxviii. 10., relates to us the command to the women to bring to the disciples the account of the resurrection. Mark xvi. 7., expressly again adds Peter: τοις μαθηταις και τῳ Πετρῳ.

Such a scrupulous care to insert the name of Peter in particular passages, where neither the circumstances of the fact required it, and where no particular light accrued to it by this addition, (as in Mark i. 36., v. 37., xiii. 3., xvi. 7.) discloses an indi-

vidual interest of the author. The continual presence of this Apostle and the intentional mention of him, where it contributed nothing to the elucidation of the narrative, could only then have a second historical object; viz. the authenticity conferred by his testimony. At least the interest of Mark in adding the name of Peter without necessity, as to the circumstantiality or intelligibility of the event, is explained fully from the accounts of the ancients respecting the sources of Mark:—so far, these traces dispersed in the book so well harmonize with these accounts, that they favour and corroborate their credibility.

SECTION XXVIII.

Although Mark, upon the whole, has farther improved Matthew, and more accurately explained his history, he has nevertheless in some cases done the reverse, and contracted his narrative, even sometimes with the retention of his words.

Matt. xx. 11.	Mark vi. 10.
εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν	ὅπου ἐαν
πολιν, ἡ κωμην	
εἰσελθητε,	εἰσελθητε
ἐξετασατε τις ἐν αὐτῃ ἀξιος ἐστι,	εἰς οἰκιαν,
κακει μεινατε,	ἐκει μενετε,
ἑως ἂν ἐξελθητε·	ἑως ἂν ἐξελθετε,
εἰσερχομενοι δε εἰς την οἰκιαν,	ἐκειθεν,
ἀσπασασθε αὐτην· και ἐαν μεν	
ᾖ ἡ οἰκια ἀξια . . .	
. . . κ. τ. λ.	
και ὃς ἐαν μη δεξηται ὑμας,	και ὁσοι ἐαν μη δεξωνται ὑμας,
μηδε ἀκουσῃ	μηδε ἀκουσωσιν
τους λογους	

Matt. xx. 11.	Mark vi. 10.
ὑμων,	ὑμων,
ἐξερχομενοι	ἐκπορευομενοι
της οἰκιας ἡ της πολεως	
ἐκεινης,	ἐκειθεν,
ἐστιναξατε τον κονιορτον	ἐστιναξατε τον χουν
των ποδων ὑμων.	τον ὑποκατω των ποδων ὑμων.

The cause of it is most probably this, viz. that Mark, who otherwise enlarges and adorns the facts with their circumstances, considered or produced nothing farther as necessary to be added to such a fact. It was in this case superfluous to transcribe into his book whole narratives, which were sufficiently diffuse in his predecessors; he contented himself therefore with a short notice of them, and presupposed the circumstantial account to be known.

Perhaps the copiousness of individual narratives, which did not leave any thing for the revisor of Matthew, was the cause of his entirely passing over some occurrences, such as Matt. viii. 5—13. 19—21. xi. 1.; but more probably it depended on the avoucher of his accounts (*i. e.* Peter) who did not recognize the order, in which some appear in Matthew, and did not, even consequently, assign to them the place, which chronologically belonged to them; for that they took place under such chronological conditions, as appoint another place to them in the course of the history, subsequent inquiries will teach us.

SECTION XXIX.

We find few entirely new occurrences unmentioned by Matthew, and consequently exclusively peculiar to Mark; they may be about three. The one occurs at the commencement of the ministry of Jesus, Mark i. 23. A Dæmoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum, acknowledges the Divine power inherent in Jesus and is cured. The others took place shortly before the days of the passion. A blind person is brought before Jesus at Bethsaida and restored to sight by spittle and imposition of hands. Mark viii. 22—27. The last is that of the poor woman who threw two mites[s] into the treasury. Mark xii. 41—44.

This phœnomenon, also assures us that he did not intend to give an independent historical book, for which he could not want materials, and for which much less could his avoucher want abundant knowledge, but that his plan did not require any thing more, and was only confined to a revision of the existing writings of Matthew.

SECTION XXX.

The result of our investigations concerning the relation of both Evangelists may then shortly be comprised under the following points. Matthew is

[s] Hug writes "*ein Lepton*," Mark says λεπτα δυο, whom we have accordingly followed.—*Translator.*

an original author, for which he is peculiarly qualified as an eye-witness of the occurrences, as a friend of the teacher, of whom he writes, and as a depositary of his future plans:—his work came first to light. In consequence of his ultimate views, he was regardless of the succession of the facts with regard to their chronological connection, and although he did not entirely neglect it, yet he often intentionally comprised under one view certain discourses and facts, just as he found them most suitable to his particular design. Thence often arose an order in things, which was not the order in history. The detail of the individual circumstances of each occurrence did not conduce to his purposes, it was superfluous and often an impediment. An extended narrative would lead the reader through many secondary ideas, from the main view to which he had been conducted, and would distract the attention, which should be directed only to one point, viz. to perceive the picture of the Messiah, pourtrayed by the ancients, in the life of Jesus. Matthew is an historical deduction. Mark is history.

The contents of the latter are, upon the whole, not new; we very seldom find in him relations which are peculiar to him and not noticed by his predecessor. He composed his history from the materials of the former, which constitute the foundation of his work, merely aiming at the merit of more correctly improving it. His chief concern was therefore historical order, his predecessor having often preferred the didactic. Historical description, also, was, therefore, incumbent upon him, and he dared not to be so regardless and indifferent about detail, on account of particular circumstances and minor matters, which throw upon the occurrences, light, explicitness, and perspicuity. This he has likewise produced through

the instruction of one of the first and most beloved of the scholars of Jesus. Where on the other hand the narrative of his predecessor made a farther explanation unnecessary or impracticable, he expressed himself more concisely, in which case, the reader, from the nature of the matter, was referred to the preceding historical book. Some facts he omitted entirely; probably, because his source left him in uncertainty respecting the real scene of their occurrence. We may consider the composition of Mark as a history and as a critical treatise.

SECTION XXXI.

But since now these minor circumstances and these numerous additional observations, when once published and carefully collected from the mouths of the eye-witnesses require, in order to be retained in the memory, and not mixed or confounded, to be immediately apprehended, firmly secured, and committed to paper: and since the circumstances of Mark's life, the security of the history and the internal evidences in the treatise itself, establish Peter as the source, from whom the peculiar informations and the circumstantiality of the narrative, which we observe in this Gospel, have proceeded: so, the farther assertion of the ancients, that Mark noted down in writing and communicated to us the public discourses of Peter, is then very correct; and I conceive the origin of Mark's Gospel, to have been this.

After the Gospel of Matthew became known during the time that the Apostles taught in Rome, (Sect. 16.) this first biographical record of their ex-

alted Master, was there conveyed to them, perhaps through the means of Matthew himself, or through those of others, which, on account of the novelty of matter, its consequence in regard to the situation and concerns of Christianity in Palestine, could soon be done by means of the several messengers, which were sent to them by the devout Churches, by means of Jews emigrating on account of the war[h], or the constant intercourse which subsisted on that account between Rome and Judæa. The mutual interest of the believers caused it to be read in the assemblies, and Peter, who was peculiarly qualified for it, delivered elucidations and remarks upon it. Mark availed himself of these explanations, and preserved them by committing them to paper, wherein his closer connection with his teacher assisted him. The elucidations, which an eye-witness and assistant or companion of the actions of Jesus had delivered on the book of an eye-witness, were of an extraordinary value in settling the believers in the faith, and in furnishing them with full information, hence they besought Mark to make his observations publicly useful and to communicate them in a treatise, whence his Gospel was called κηρυξις Πετρου, the preaching of Peter, and he himself the interpreter of the Apostle.

From these relations of the voucher and the author we must explain to ourselves, how he in some occurrences connected with Peter (for instance, Matt. xiv. 28—32. xvi. 18—20., where we might expect him to be more full) has even expressed himself more briefly than Matthew. For, that which individually concerned the person of Peter, and

[h] These emigrations had already commenced under Albinus, before the insurrection had broken out. Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. ii. according to Haverk's edit. c. 14. n. 2. according to the Basle, c. 24. p. 738. and Antiq. L. xx. c. ult.

where he stood in the narrative, as the one chiefly reproached, was more concisely treated and more quickly passed over by Peter himself in his discourse. The modest man comments upon himself and his own actions as little as possible, thus he in mentioning his frailties is not able to suppress the bashful embarrassment of a virtuous soul [i].

We however would clearly exhibit, in conclusion, the state of the time in which all this could have happened. Nero amused himself in Achaia, whither he also was accompanied by Vespasian, with his inglorious scientific occupations. In the mean time the ill-used Palestine revolted; Vespasian obtained the commission to punish it [k]. It was already winter, when Nero embarked for Rome, and Titus for Alexandria, and when Vespasian hastened over the Hellespont to Syria [l]. When the season became sufficiently favourable to open the campaign, Vespasian marched his legions into Galilee, took possession of several places, and besieged Jotapata on the 21st of Artemesius [m], our month of May. In the month Panenius, (July) *in the thirteenth year of Nero,* this place fell [n]; it was followed in Gorpiæus, (September) by Tarichæa: in Hyperberetæus, (October) by Gamala, and after Gishala had surrendered,

[i] Eusebius's words, Demonstr. Evangel. L. iii. p. 78, 79. Edit. Rob. Steph. deserve to be remarked, in comparing Matthew xvi. 15—20. with Mark viii. 29, 30. τοσουτων ειρημενων τῳ Πετρῳ ὑπο του Ἰησου, ὁ Μαρκος μηδεν τουτων μνημονευσας, ὁτι μηδ' ὁ Πετρος ταυθ', ὡς εἰκος, ἐν ταις αὐτου διδασκαλιαις ἐξηγορευσεν . . . .—διο και Μαρκος αὐτα παρελιπεν.

[k] Sueton. in Vespas. c. 4. Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. iii. c. 1.

[l] Dio. Cass. L. lxiii. p. 723. Wechel. Jos. Bell. Jud. L. iii. c. 4. n. 2.

[m] Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. iii. c. 7. n. 3.

[n] Ibid. L. iii. c. 7. n. 36.

no fortified place remained: Galilee was laid waste and subjugated [o].

The insurrection in Judæa and its metropolis raged so much the more furiously: the scenes with the Idumæans followed; the massacre in the temple and the murder of Zachariah [p]. At the time of these events Matthew finished his Gospel; viz. in the winter of the commencement of the fourteenth year of Nero; or, since the years of Nero, (as we shall show in the supplementary chronological table to the Acts of the Apostles) begin about a quarter of a year before the Christian, towards the end of the sixty-eighth year after the birth of our Lord.

During the winter the Romans were at rest, but at the appearance of spring Vespasian came by Antipatris, Lydda, Jamnia, down to Emmaus, and formed a junction with the army, which was approaching on the Eastern side of the Jordan, under the command of Trajan, near Jericho, whose inhabitants fled into the mountains [q]. With the beginning of the campaign in spring the sea was navigable; the regular roads of communication with Rome were re-established: the Gospel of Matthew, the first history which appeared, concerning the fate, works, and doctrines of the Author of the Christian school, was circulated as a curiosity in the capital of the world, and was read and explained in the Christian assemblies. Some time afterwards in the month of June, Nero died. He had begun to reign in the month of October, and continued to reign during thirteen years and eight months [r]. That he died in summer, we learn

[o] Josh. Bell. Jud. L. iii. c. 10. n. 10. L. iv. c. 1. n. 10. c. 2.

[p] Ibid. L. iv. c. 5 and 6.

[q] Ibid. L. iv. c. 8. n. 1 and 2.

[r] Aurel. Victor. Epitome, c. 5. says, annis tredecim. Eutrop. L. vii. c. 15. imperii decimo quarto obiit. Tacit. histor. I. c. 5.

from Plutarch; it was summer, says he, when, with an incredible expedition in seven days, an express brought from Rome to Galba, who was in Spain, the account of Nero's death [s].

The new emperor put himself into motion with his army, but his approach was slow and sanguinary [t]. During this time the city was in the hands of Nymphidius Sabinus and Tigellinus, until the last was forced to lay down his arms. Under them, ἐπι των ἡγουμενων, if we rightly understand the expression of Clemens Romanus respecting this occurrence, Peter and Paul were executed, *i. e.* between the latter days of Nero and the arrival of Galba. See in the sequel, Sect. 78, the treatise upon the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles, immediately before the chronological table. After their death as we have before shown, Sect. 16, Mark published his Gospel. The commotions under Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, comprise one year and twenty-two days [u]. The publication consequently took place in the sixty-ninth year after the birth, and in the thirty-seventh after the death of Jesus.

annos quatuordecim Sueton. Ner. c. 40. paulo minus quatuordecim annis. Dio. L. lxiii. p. 727. ἐτη δεκατρια μηνας ὀκτω. Jos. Bell. Jud. L. iv. c. 9. n. 2. τρεις και δεκα βασιλευσας ετη και ἡμερας ὀκτω. He has changed μηνας ὀκτω into ἡμερας ὀκτω.

[s] Plutarch in Galba, c. 7. ἡν δε θερος ἡδη, και βραχυ προ δειλης ἡκεν ἀπο Ῥωμης Σικελος ἀνηρ ἀπελευθερος Ἑβδομαιος. λ.

[t] Tacit. histor. L. i. c. 6.

[u] Dio, excerpt. Xiphilin. Vit. Vespas. p. 753. Wechel.

LUKE.

SECTION XXXII.

Luke does not begin his Gospel in the true Jewish style, with the narrative itself, but he opens his book according to the taste of the Greeks and Romans, with a Proœmium, in which he acquaints us with his views and motives and with the writings previously existing on his subject.

The correct explanation of this might destroy or raise many hypotheses, but it is unfortunately so composed, that although the individual, to whom it was directed, well understood it; we, on the contrary, to whom the relations of those days have become obscure, with difficulty alone develop its meaning. The light, which it might reflect upon the history of the origin of our first three Gospels, did not escape learned men: on which account, they laid a stress sometimes on one, and sometimes on another sentence, which appeared to them calculated to explain the origin of the Gospels *.

This introduction is divided into a period of four members, of which, the second clause is not to be considered as belonging to the third. Ἔδοξε κἀμοὶ is, as the Greek grammarians call it, an Apodosis, which according to its nature, begins another series

* On this prologue, as the introduction is also called, and on the explanation given by himself, the treatise is supported. Some ideas on the probable origin of our first three Gospels, by Dr. Ziegler, in Gabler's New Theol. Journal, year 1800. 5th part. Partly also on the origin of the first three Gospels, by Dr. Vogel, in Gabler's Journal for Select Theol. Literat. 1804. 1 vol. 1 book.

of sentences, and only takes place after a concluded protasis. The members of the one are thus separated from the other, and every one of them has its proper extent. Luke begins to speak of himself with ἐδοξε κἀμοι, and that which precedes has been separated by himself, as not belonging to him as an individual.

If καθως παρεδοσαν belonged to ἐδοξε κἀμοι, and to his own person, it ought, in that case, if the construction was intended to be grammatically framed, to be arranged under it, and the course of the sentences should be thus: ἐδοξε κἀμοι παρηκολουθηκοτι ἀνωθεν πασιν ἀκριβως, καθως παρεδοσαν ἡμιν οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχης αὐτοπται . . . . . καθεξης σοι γραψαι. This is however not the case; on which account as far as καθως παρεδοσαν falls in the sphere of generality; while that which stands after ἐδοξε κἀμοι refers to Luke in particular. The period thus contains two parts, the general and the particular one.

The major proposition of the first part has a decisive tenor and asserts,—Many have composed historical books concerning our Lord. The minor proposition compared with the first is—SUCH AS THE EYE-WITNESSES—(we should conceive)—*have published.* But the words καθως παρεδοσαν leave room for another explanation.

Παραδιδοναι signifies, properly, to give, hand over, or deliver something into another's hands; in an improper sense it signifies, to verbally communicate something to another, such as knowledge, instruction: in each case we must supply the ellipsis διηγησιν, or tacitly infer it from the major. According to the first signification of the word the passage would run thus:—*As many have attempted to compose a history of the events which are well known among us; such as they who from the beginning were eye-witnesses and co-operators in the instruction have given*

into our hands; so I also thought myself qualified, etc. According to the second interpretation of the word it would require to be translated thus: *As many.... to compose, as those, who were from the beginning witnesses..... have verbally communicated it to us; I also thought myself qualified.*

Which now of the two significations is the correct one? We must most particularly keep well in view one idea in the Procemium. Luke wishes to give reasons for his undertaking, and believes it necessary to apologize for his publication of a memorial respecting our Lord. *As many had done so,* he had no reason to apologize. A man who had taken such a part in the promulgation of Christianity, who had laboured in common with its principal advocates, and occupied, after them the first rank, as to knowledge and merit had a decidedly more privileged claim than others to do so. The case would then only be different, if works of the eye-witnesses and ministers of the Christian doctrine were already in existence; he owed to them that respect, and the example of many, who had ventured to appear after such great authorities, would exculpate him; chiefly as they stood far beneath him in the right to such an undertaking.

If then only in case, that greater and more dignified authors had already preceded him, such an apology could be admissible, the first explanation is the true one "as many have attempted to compose historical works such as those, which the eye-witnesses and the ministers of the doctrine *had delivered to them.*"

The other explanation, "as several have attempted to compose histories, as the eye-witnesses *have orally delivered* them," proceeds from the supposition, that the Apostles, before an historical work on the

life and actions of our Lord had appeared, had so delivered his history in the assemblies with explicitness according to its circumstances and the succession of events, that historical books could be composed from a written collection of them. But this was not the Apostles' mode of teaching. As far as the instruction was historical, it only extended to the chief points of the history: to the sufferings, the death of our Lord, and the pillar of the whole doctrine, his resurrection. Acts v. 30, 31. xiii. 28—39. xvii. 3. x. 38—42. 1 Cor. xv. 1—9. 20—29. The circumstantial treatment of these events arose from references to prophetical declarations, from which it was shewn that this course of destiny was præallotted to the Messiah. Compare the above passages, also Acts xxvii. 3 & 11. καθ' ἡμεραν ἀνακρινοντες τας γραφας, εἰ ἐχει ταυτα οὑτως. viii. 35. xviii. 28. xxvi. 22, 23. xxviii. 23, 24. With these were united the propositions of faith relative to his dominion over the world which he, as Messiah, assumed after his entrance into glory, relative to a last judgment and retribution in another existence, as may be seen from several before mentioned passages. They were obliged to stay, at least, abroad, for a very long time at one place, as Paul at Corinth, Ephesus and Rome, before they could circulate a full statement of the history.

But at home, in the native land of Christianity, the previous knowledge of the people emancipated them entirely from such tedious proceedings. The acts and deeds of Jesus were there considered so universally known, that in Palestine, as to his history, they only referred in sermons and teaching to the common knowledge of the existing age, as Peter, (according to the account in the Acts of the Apostles, ii. 22., and afterwards, Acts x. 37.) even upon the occasion of the conversion of a Heathen, at

Cæsarea, and as Paul did much later still, before king Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 26. Since then the history might be considered as universally known in Palestine, the mode of teaching was formed from it so as to establish more firmly the chief points, and then to build thereupon the doctrine of faith.

The conduct of the Apostles, out of Palestine, if they did not stay at any place for a long time, therefore contradicts such a suspicious κηρυγμα, or such extensive and connected narratives, as we might compose from the same historical books on the ministry of Jesus, but in particular, the conduct of the Apostles in Palestine, where they directly referred to the previous knowledge, which already existed among the people themselves, contradicts this circumstantial historical teaching.

The words καθως παρεδοσαν ἡμιν admit then of no other interpretation but the following: a narrative, such as that which the eye-witnesses and the ministers of the doctrine *have delivered to us.*

Thus much suffices concerning the first part of this period: the second ἐδοξε κἀμοι contains a counter-clause. As many have ventured to compose histories after the example of the eye-witnesses, *I also thought myself authorized.* The words παρηκολουθηκοτι ἀνωθεν πασιν ἀκριβως, contain a farther reason, by which he explains and substantiates his qualification. (I [y] misunderstood the words and first corrected my mistake in my lectures upon the speech of Demosthenes pro coronâ.)

Παρακολουθειν includes the idea of presence. If spoken of facts, it signifies to be present during their continuance, and in a more confined sense to be eye-witness to that which has happened. It moreover

[y] *i. e.* in the first edition.

signifies also to be present with selfpossession; to accompany a speech, a discourse or a written composition, with attention, as it often occurs in the ancients [s].

We have a double choice in πασι: to refer it to the persons which are named in that which precedes; or to πραγματα, to the well known occurrences. For, these are the two substantives plural, to which πασι may be referred.

If it be referred to the persons, for instance, to the αὐτοπται and ὑπηρεται του λογου, the sentence would have this meaning: "after having read the eye-witnesses with care, I will now, that thou mayest no longer be in error, inform thee of the truth." Whom would not the conduct of the historian rouse, who modestly apologizes for venturing to publish a memorial of our Lord after the ministers of the doctrine, and on the other hand, presumes to say that he will now bring to light the truth, which had not yet been done; that is, to give a more faithful account than they? If we would refer πασι to both, to *the many* πολλοι, and to the eye-witnesses at the same time (since in this case the expression πασι comprises all of them, and must include both) no injustice is done to *the many*, when Luke deems himself better informed than they: it is rather conformably to his higher station and his views; but the same disrespectful expression towards the eye-witnesses and the ministers of the doctrine exists still; he even throws them together with "*the many*" in a category, which is still more unbecoming. If he had intended this: viz. "I have read them with

[s] Theophrast. Character. Procem. Polyb. L. i. c. 12. L. iii. c. 62. and several passages by Gataker ad Antonin. L. v. § 5. p. 188. Raphelius annotat. in N. T. ex Polyb. etc. Kypke, Wetsten ad h. loc.

great care," he might have expressed himself correctly and accurately, if, instead of, "I have read *the persons* with great care," he had placed *the writings*, which he could have done by the change of two syllables; ἀναταξασθαι διηγησεις, and παρηκολουθηκοτι—πασαις.

The other substantive plural to which, πασιν might refer, is πραγματα, the well known occurrences. The phrase παρακολουθειν τοις πραγμασι is current with the ancients, and signifies *attentively to follow circumstances, as they occur*. Yet in this a gradation exists: with regard to an individual fact which is confined to one place, it signifies, to be present, to be an eye-witness to it: as in the passage which we have cited from Lucian's Lapithæan feast. But if the discourse relate to occurrences not confined to one place, but which happen in different provinces, and have whole countries for their theatres, it means, to accompany them with observation from a certain station. Thus Demosthenes, as a statesman, surveyed the occurrences of his time; Thucydides, as a warrior, the occurrences of the Peloponnesian, and Josephus, of the Jewish war.

In this sense παρακολουθειν τοις πραγμασι is used by them in the passages which [a] we have quoted.

Of this sort were the actions of Jesus: not con-

[a] Demosth. de Coronâ. c. 33. p. 382. ed. Harles. 1768. Reiske, T. 1. p. 285. n. 20. ἐκεινος ὁ καιρος, και ἡ ἡμερα ἐκεινη, οὐ μονον εὐνουν και πλουσιον ἀνδρα ἐκαλει, ἀλλα και παρηκολουθηκοτα τοις πραγμασιν ἐξ ἀρχης, και συλλογισομενον ὀρθως. De falsâ legat. p. 423. n. 20. ὁ τα τουτου πονηρευματα ἀκριβεστατα εἰδως ἐγω, και παρηκολουθηκως ἁπασι. In Aristocrat. p. 683. n. 5. τι δηποτε, ταυτ' εἰδως οὑτως ἀκριβως ἐγω, και παρηκολουθηκως ἑνιοις των ἀδικηματων. T. 11. in Olympiodor. p. 1178. n. 10. τοις εἰδοσιν ἀκριβως ἁπαντα ταυτα τα πραγματα ὡς ἐχει, και παρηκολουθηκοσιν ἐξαρχης. Demost. Epist. 1. p. 1463. *fine*. ἀλλα ὁσα τυγχανω δι' ἐμπειριαν, και το παρηκολουθηκεναι τοις

fined to one place but dispersed over Galilee and Judæa. If now Luke asserts that he is παρηκολουθηκως ἀνωθεν πασιν ἀκριβως—τοις πραγμασι—he does not

πραγμασιν εἰδως, ταυτ' ἐβουληθην τοις μεν προαιρουμενοις λεγειν ἐμφανη ποιησας.

The Scholiast on Thucyd. v. 26. καθ' ἡσυχιαν τι αὐτων μαλλον αἰσθεσθαι, illustrates the words; διὰ το ἡσυχαζειν και το πολεμειν αὐτον, μαλλον παρακολουθησαι τοις γενομενοις. Joseph. L. 1. contra Apion. c. 10. δεον ἐκεινο γινωσκειν, ὁτι δει τον ἀλλοις παραδωσιν πραξεων αληθινων ὑπισχνουμενον, αὐτας ἐπιστασθαι ταυτας προτερον ἀκριβως, ἡ παρηκολουθηκοτα τοις γεγονοσιν, ἡ παρα των εἰδοτων πυνθανομενον. We see the antithesis of the last words. The same antithesis recurs, vitâ Josephi, c. 65. p. 33., in the digression concerning Justus of Tiberias: μητε τα πραχθεντα κατα την Γαλιλαιαν ἐπισταμενος, ἡς γαρ ἐν Βηρυτῳ τοτε παρα βασιλει, μηθ' ὁσα ἐπαθον Ῥωμαιοι ἐπι της Ἰωταπατων πολιορκιας, ἡ ἐδρασαν ἡμας, παρακολουθησας, μηθ' ὁσα κατ' ἐμαυτον ἐπραξα πολιορκουμενος δυνηθεις πυθεσθαι. Παντες γαρ οἱ ἀπαγγειλαντες ἀν διεφθαρησαν ἐπι της παραταξεως ἐκεινης.

The soldiers complain, Polyb. L. 1. c. 67. against the Carthaginians, because they had not sent them generals, who were acquainted with their merits in Sicily, but one, who had never had personal experience of these deeds: Καρχηδονιους ἐπιτηδες τους μεν εἰδοτας στρατηγους τας γεγενημενας χρειας κατα Σικελιαν ἐξ αὐτων ..... οὐκ ἐξαποστελλειν ὡς αὐτους, τον δε μηδενι τουτων παρηκολουθηκοτα, τουτον ἐπεπομφεναι. We remark the counter-passage in Lucian, conviv. Seu, Lapith. T. ix. Bip. p. 46. ὡστε θαυμαζω, εἰ τι σαφες εἰπειν ἐδυνατο, μη παρακολουθησας ἐκεινοις, ἀφ' ὡν ἀρξαμενη ἐς το αἱμα ἐτελευτησεν αὐτη ἡ φιλονικεια. Compare Raphelius, Wetstein. In the N. T. this expression occurs, 1 Timoth. iv. 6. και της καλης διδασκαλιας, ἡ παρηκολουθηκας, in the instruction of which thou hast been a present witness. We find it in a more confined sense in 2 Timoth. iii. 10. συ δε παρηκολουθηκας μου τη διδασκαλιᾳ, τη ἀγωγῃ. Thou wast an observing witness to my doctrine; but in the following verse: τοις διωγμοις ..... ἐν Ἀντιοχειᾳ, ἐν Ἰκονιῳ, it admits of a more extensive interpretation. Thou wast in the neighbourhood, on the theatre of the persecutions, which I endured at Antioch, Iconium, Lystra. For, at that time Timothy was not yet connected with Paul, he was still a youth; but educated in these provinces, Acts xvi. 1, 2., where he might have seen some and heard other matters on the spot.

declare himself to be an eye-witness of each fact, but nevertheless, as present on the theatre, where he as an observer could obtain a view of the occurrences; and indeed ἀνωθεν, from the beginning, from the development of them. He therefore intended to say; "so I also think myself authorized who have attentively followed all these occurrences accurately from their beginning," &c. By this then he has established his privilege above "*the many*," in a distinguished manner.

Next, he promises καθ' ἑξης γραψαι; as Thucydides in the Proœium explains it ἑξης, ὡς ἑκαστα ἐγιγνετο in succession: *i. e.* to register them according to the course, in which the events followed each other.

He farther promises to Theophilus, for whom he principally intended his book, την ἀσφαλειαν: a certain information—the true detail. If now "*the many*" whom Luke mentions as authors, had written from the mouths of the Apostles and committed to paper, their historical discourses, how could he, in this case, promise to Theophilus a greater certainty? This is a reiterated confirmation, that the words καθως παρεδοσαν. λ. do not mean, *as the Apostles have orally delivered.*

He was to receive this ἀσφαλεια; as the historian says in his address to Theophilus, περι ὡν κατηχηθης λογων. The words refer either to the Christian information in general, which Theophilus has received, which Luke wished then to exalt to a certainty; or to the account of "*the many*," a knowledge of the contents of which Theophilus had received through a verbal communication. I do not believe, that Luke intended to suggest to his friend by a hint the ambiguity and uncertainty of the instruction he had received; or to depreciate the

teachers whom he had. The λογοι, περι ὠν κατηχηθη, can therefore only be the oral communications which he had obtained from the historical books of "*the many*," which Luke wishes to correct and deliver to his friend so much of the existing historical matter, as was true and authenticated.

If we then once more peruse our Proœmium, we shall find it containing the following clauses :—

"*Many have composed histories of the actions of our Lord such as those which the eye-witnesses and the ministers of the doctrine have published. —It will therefore also be permitted to me, to enumerate these events for thee, according to their succession, that thou mayest be acquainted with the truth and certainty of the different relations, which have been delivered to thee; especially as I have carefully and attentively followed the events on their theatre, when they began to be developed.*"—In this lies the description of Christian literature, as Luke had it before his eyes.

1. According to this description, writings appeared relative to the history of Jesus, by the eye-witnesses and the promulgators of the faith, which had met with such a reception in the Christian school, that others also were encouraged and induced to signalize themselves by similar works, the number of which was not confined merely to one or two, but to *many*. Although neither for their witness and knowledge of the occurrences, nor in virtue of their vocation, could they expect a regard equal to the others, they nevertheless did not pass without notice or reputation. Much less then may it be supposed, that the works of an apostolical origin shared this fate, and remained unknown to the sub-

sequent authors. At least, Luke, as we perceive, knew his predecessors, and with regard to him the contrary is absolutely incorrect.

2. "*The many*" did not *translate* from a book lying before them; nor perhaps by the aid of *already made translations*, but they COMPOSED their historical books, συνεταξαν διηγησεις—not ἡρμηνευσαν. This was their conduct, and the general conduct, from which, that of the eye-witnesses may be the more easily judged, the less reason they had to depend upon other assistance. It is clear and evident, that Luke did not act differently: he asserts his independence, he appeals on its behalf to his presence on the theatre of events whilst they happened, he pledges himself to represent them in their succession, and to give a true account of that which had taken place. If the hypotheses of the time might thus be applicable to others, they were not so to him.

3. From the facts which we have cited in illustration of the proœmium, this also is apparent. As long as they could lay claim to the general knowledge of the people, the want of a history was no where felt, neither on the part of the teachers, nor on that of the people. But when the generation of cotemporaries began gradually to decrease, and when the number of those who, as cotemporary vouchers, preserved the reputation of our Lord's actions, continued to diminish, the want of records began to be felt, and the decreasing voice of the multitude required to be replaced by written accounts. Hence, we perceive, that the history could not have commenced early, not until long after the death of our Lord. But the persons employed in teaching, must have

been the first, who from the impediments in their employment perceived the necessity of aiding the decaying knowledge of the people; whence it is very credible, that the first histories came from the Apostles.

But now it happened, as it does in general: the road being opened, "*the many*" soon followed, who collected the narratives of their fathers, and brought together the other sayings of the time; and thus at once an historical age in the Christian school arose.

4. Under these circumstances Luke appeared, whose peculiar object was to set his friend at rest respecting *the many* histories which had succeeded the first works of the Apostles, and to replace their unauthenticated accounts by a true representation of the facts.

SECTION XXXIII.

Luke was, from the tone and character of his language, a Jew or a Syrian, although we indeed perceive in his expressions a greater degree of Greek elegance, than in the other Gospels. If we take into consideration the acquaintance with Judaism, which he shows in both works, we must confess, that he had not collected the opinions of this people imperfectly, and by halves, difficult as they were for a stranger to comprehend; and that he had not merely superficially understood the ceremonies of the worship of their God and of their temple. No where is the expositor at a loss, no where does he become tempted to wish, that the author had a better insight

into Judaism, its rituals and ceremonials. For this, we desire no particular proofs from examples, as their number would become too great, and we should be obliged to pay our attention to many minutiæ, which however are those which evince an accurate knowledge of things. We can conclude thus much from the language and from his notions:—from the first that he was a Syrian or native of Palestine:—from the second, that he was a Jew, or well-instructed Proselyte.

As to the first, we receive from history a decisive information, according to which Luke was born in Syrian Antioch [b].

However, as to that which concerns his religious connexions, we infer from the Epistle to the Colossians, that he from his own choice, but not from descent or birth, professed Judaism. Paul adds at the end the greetings of the friends who were at that time at his side, and mentions first the descendants of Jews, iv. 10. 12. After having concluded the list of those who were ἐκ περιτομης, he then also adds the others, and among them Luke 11—15. who is consequently rather to be considered as a Proselyte.

As to his civil vocation, he was a physician, Colos. iv. 14 [c] to perfect himself in which he could not want opportunities in a scientific city like Antioch. Perhaps, the desire to become more acquainted with the religion, which he had chosen, led

[b] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. c. 4. Hieronym. Scriptor. Eccles. V. Lucas.

[c] In his writings we shall find traces, which proclaim the physician. In the Gospel iv. 38., he speaks of a πυρετῳ μεγαλῳ, so Galen de different. Febr. distinguishes between τον μεγαν τε και μικρον πυρετον. Wetsten. ad. h. l. In Acts xiii. 2., he makes use of the technical word ἀχλυς, for blindness. Galen. apud. Wetsten. ad. h. l.

him to Palestine, the original seat of Judaism, as the thirst for his native learning had led Paul. But, whatever may have been the cause of it, he resided according to the proœmium in the country, when Jesus entered upon his mission, and wandered hither and thither teaching and curing. In the capacity of a physician Luke had a particular reason to pay attention to phœnomena of this sort, and for this reason his accounts, being the words of a professional man, claim a particular value.

The tradition has been preserved as to his situation in the Christian school at its beginning, that Luke was one of the seventy disciples [d]. We might confirm this account by the observation, that he alone of the Evangelists has mentioned the seventy, and carefully treated of the history of their mission and return, and the instructions which were given to them, x. 1—25., as if he felt himself induced to do so, by means of a particular participation in them: so, also, in other respects, he displays such a knowledge of this occurrence, as might be expected from an eye-witness.

He has no where mentioned the time, at which he quitted Palestine. When Paul ventured for the first time a journey over to Europe, Luke resided at Alexandria-Troas, and went with him, Acts xvi. 11. Had he perchance already made acquaintance with

[d] Origen. Dialog. contra Marcion. Sect. I. p. 8. edit. Wetsten. and Vol. i. opp. p. 806. edit. de la Rue. Epiphan. adv. Hæres. xxxi. or L. i. §. 12.

Theophylact. Procem. in Comment. in Evang. Luc. seems to have had a good authority before him, from which he transcribed the words: Λουκας ὁ θειος, Ἀντιοχευς μεν ἡν, ἰατρος δε και την ἐξω σοφιαν πολυς, οὐ μεν ἀλλα και την ἑβραϊκην παιδειαν ἐξησκησατο, τοις Ἱεροσολυμοις ἐπιφοιτησας, ὁτε ὁ κυριος ἡμων ἐδιδασκεν· ὡστε φασι τινες ἑνα και αὐτον γενεσθαι των ἑβδομηκοντα ἀποστολων.

Paul at Antioch? and thence urged by inclination and reverence did he offer himself to Paul as a companion on this voyage? He accompanied the Apostle over to Philippi, Acts xvi. 16, 17., and when he was there thrown into prison, Luke remained free, and seems even to have resided in this city for a longer time. When Paul some years afterwards commenced his return from his second European voyage to Asia, by way of Macedonia, Luke was still there. He must then have necessarily come from Asia as far as Philippi to meet the Apostle: at all events, he was, at the embarkation for Troas, in the company of Paul, Acts xx. 6. and went with him to Jerusalem, Acts xxi. 17. where he was seized.

Luke also at this time did not participate in his imprisonment; but seems voluntarily to have followed him to Cæsarea, and as the friends of the prisoner were allowed ingress to him, Acts xxiv. 23. he seems not to have forsaken him, until his destination was determined. Then, when he was sent to Rome, there to receive his sentence, Luke embarked with Paul, Acts xxvii. 1. and remained at his side, 2 Timoth. iv. 11. Coloss. iv. 14. Philem. 24. until the decision of his fate.

He was also sometimes suspected to have been the person, to whom Paul in the Epistle to the Romans xvi. 2. sends greeting under the name of Lucius: but Luke was not at Corinth, at the time when this Epistle was written. He resided, as we have observed, at Philippi, or had perhaps come over from Troas to meet the Apostle, when he proceeded through Macedonia. Which ever may be the truth, is indifferent, as far as it relates to this question: but his separation at that time from Paul does not sufficiently authorize us in confounding our Luke with this Lucius.

Some manuscripts of the more ancient Latin version call his book, EVANGELIUM SECUNDUM LUCANUM[e]: whence it has been inferred, that he must at least have been a freed-man, whose name according to the Roman custom was changed into Lucanus. The supposition was the more agreeable, because servants often exercised the medical art[f].

But independently of not finding any trace of this change of name either in the Church-teachers or in other versions, we know, that the Latin transcribers sometimes allowed to themselves the liberty of changing Offa into Offanus, and Beda into Bedanus[g].

SECTION XXXIV.

HE wrote his Gospel more immediately for a certain Theophilus, to whom he gives the title κρατιστος, which was given in ancient inscriptions to the High Priests and Priestesses, the superintendents of holy edifices and spectacles, the representatives of the monarch in the provinces, the overseers of the revenues of the emperor ἐπιτροποις του Καισαρος[h], *Ducenariis Exactoribus,* such as the ἐπιτροποι are in the Palmyrene inscriptions.

If we were better informed respecting the person to whom Luke dedicated his work, the history of this

[e] Cod. Vercell. S. Eusebii. Vindobon. Cottonian.

[f] Sueton. in Caio. c. 8. Seneca de benef. iii. 24. Quinctilian vii. 2. n. 26.

[g] Mabillon, Vet. Analect. T. iv. p. 521.

[h] Wheeler's Journey into Greece. B. iii. p. 233. ΑΝΤ. ΚΛ. ΑΛΦΗΝΟΝ ΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΥ. κ.τ.λ.

Gospel might be explained in many points; but unfortunately the investigations on this subject are very unsatisfactory, they forsake us too much, in general, and promise little hope for the future.

According to the observations, which Luke has made, for the sake of being plain and intelligible to his reader, he was certainly not a native of Palestine. In speaking of Capernaum he is obliged to add for him, that it is a city in Galilee, iv. 31. He is obliged to add the same concerning Nazareth, i. 26. and Arimathea, xxiii. 51. When he mentions the country of the Gadarenes, he is obliged to specify diffusely its situation, viii. 26. He describes the situation of the Mount of Olives and its distance from Jerusalem, Acts i. 12., and determines by Stadia, the distance of the place called Emmaus from the capital. Gospel of Luke xxiv. 13.

He was certainly also no Cretan, Acts xxvii. 8, 12. no Athenian, or one living in the neighbourhood, for in that case there would be no necessity for explaining by an observation (Acts xvii. 21,) the characteristic trait of this nation, which Demosthenes, OR. i. *in Phil.* had already delineated; ἢ βουλεσθε περιοντες πυνθανεσθαι κατα την ἀγοραν, λεγεται τι καινον;—Also we cannot account him to have been a Macedonian, Acts xvi. 12.

A native of Antioch also could hardly be so ignorant of the geography of Palestine, which was near. That he was an Alexandrian, which the Lexicographer Bar Bahlul makes him, is a more recent pretence, which is entirely subverted by the old Alexandrian teachers not appropriating this reputation to their Church. Origen knows no more than that Luke wrote for the heathens. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. Lib. vi. c. 25.

The testimony of the Alexandrian Patriarch,

Eutychius, which decides in favour of an illustrious person in Rome or Italy[j], is too remote from these times, to be in any way decisive; there are nevertheless some grounds for it. For we see, that Luke makes it his business to instruct his Theophilus, by means of explanations, respecting the places, with which he thought him unacquainted. He pursues the same method in relating the voyage of the Apostle to Rome, and assists his account by descriptions, Acts xxvii. 8. 12. 16. But as soon as he approaches towards Sicily and Italy, (Acts xxviii. 12, 13, & 15.) he puts down all the places as though they were known to him, *e. g.* Syracuse, Rhegium, Pouzzolo, (on the name of which Josephus was obliged to make comments for Greek or Oriental readers[k]), and even still less things, such as Tres Tabernæ, Via Appia, etc.

SECTION XXXV.

That Luke was acquainted with Matthew, we perceive in many passages; but it is most evident in those parts, which Mark has taken out of their con-

[j] وفي عصر هذا الملك ايضاً كَتَبَ لوقا انجيلهُ باليونانية الي رجل شريف من علما الروم يقول لهُ ثاوفيل Eutych. Orig. Eccles. Alex. edit. Seldeni. Lond. 1642. p. 36. The author plainly distinguishes between الروم and يونانية consequently the word روم has its restricted signification of Rome or its district, contrary to the otherwise common use of the Arabic language. The whole work appeared afterwards: Eutychii. Patr. Alexandrini. Annales, Jo. Seldeno et Edw. Pocockio. Oxon. 1658, where the passage is found in T. 1. p. 334.

[k] Josephi vita. p. 626. edit. Basil. *Δικαιαρχιαν, ἣν Ἰταλοι Ποτιολους καλοῦσι.*

nection, and afterwards overlooked in the places to which they belonged[1]. These Luke has again restored from Matthew and inserted *ad verba* in his book.

Matt. viii. 19.	Luke ix. 57.
ἀκολουθησω σοι ὁπου	ἀκολουθησω σοι ὁπου
ἐαν ἀπερχῃ.	ἐαν ἀπερχῃ.
λεγει αὐτῳ ὁ Ἰησους,	και εἰπεν αὐτῳ ὁ Ἰησους,
αἱ ἀλωπεκες φωλεους ἐχουσι,	αἱ ἀλωπεκες φωλεους ἐχουσι
και τα πετεινα του οὐρανου	και τα πετεινα του οὐρανου
κατασκηνωσεις,	κατασκηνωσεις,
ὁ δε υἱος του ἀνθρωπου	ὁ δε υἱος του ἀνθρωπου
οὐκ ἐχει,	οὐκ ἐχει,
που την κεφαλην κλινῃ.	που την κεφαλην κλινῃ.
Matt. viii. 9.	**Luke vii. 8.**
και γαρ ἐγω ἀνθρωπος εἰμι	και γαρ ἐγω ἀνθρωπος εἰμι
ὑπο ἐξουσιαν,	ὑπο ἐξουσιαν
	τασσομενος,
ἐχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτον στρατιωτας,	ἐχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτον στρατιωτας,
και λεγω τουτῳ, πορευθητι,	και λεγω τουτῳ, πορευθητι,
και πορευεται,	και πορευεται,
και ἀλλῳ, ἐρχου,	και ἀλλῳ, ἐρχου,
και ἐρχεται,	και ἐρχεται,
και τῳ δουλῳ μου, ποιησον	και τῳ δουλῳ μου, ποιησον
τουτο,	τουτο,
και ποιει.	και ποιει.
ἀκουσας δε ὁ Ἰησους	ἀκουσας δε ὁ Ἰησους
ἐθαυμασε,	ἐθαυμασεν αὐτον,
και εἰπε τοις ἀκολουθουσι,	και στραφεις τῳ ἀκολουθουντι
	αὐτῳ ὀχλῳ εἰπε,
ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν,	λεγω ὑμιν,
οὐδε ἐν τῳ Ἰσραηλ	οὐδε ἐν τῳ Ἰσραηλ
τοσαυτην πιστιν εὑρον.	τοσαυτην πιστιν εὑρον.

[1] Hug's observations on the three first Gospels, particularly on that of Luke, are very ably examined in the introduction to Schleiermacher by his Translator, pp. 98—115, to which the reader is referred.—*Translator.*

Matt. xii. 43.	Luke xi. 24.
ὁταν δε το ἀκαθαρτον πνευμα	ὁταν δε το ἀκαθαρτον πνευμα
ἐξελθῃ ἀπο του ἀνθρωπου,	ἐξελθῃ ἀπο του ἀνθρωπου,
διερχεται δι' ἀνυδρων τοπων	διερχεται δι' ἀνυδρων τοπων
ζητουν ἀναπαυσιν,	ζητουν ἀναπαυσιν,
και οὐκ εὑρισκει·	και μη εὑρισκων
τοτε λεγει, ὑποστρεψω	λεγει, ὑποστρεψω
εἰς τον οἰκον μου,	εἰς τον οἰκον μου,
ὁθεν ἐξηλθον,	ὁθεν ἐξηλθον,
και ἐλθων εὑρισκει	και ἐλθων εὑρισκει
σχολαζοντα,	
σεσαρωμενον, και κεκοσμημενον,	σεσαρωμενον και κεκοσμημενον,
τοτε πορευεται και παραλαμβανει	τοτε πορευεται και παραλαμβανει
μεθ' ἑαυτου	
ἑπτα ἑτερα πνευματα	ἑπτα ἑτερα πνευματα
πονηροτερα ἑαυτου,	πονηροτερα ἑαυτου,
και εἰσελθοντα κατοικει ἐκει,	και εἰσελθοντα κατοικει ἐκει,
και γινεται τα ἐσχατα	και γινεται τα ἐσχατα
ἀνθρωπου ἐκεινου	ἀνθρωπου ἐκεινου
χειρονα των πρωτων.	χειρονα των πρωτων.

SECTION XXXVI.

This agreement with Matthew occurs, however, only in the narratives which Mark has omitted; in other respects, Luke adheres closer to the latter than to the former. As we have before referred to the feeding of the four thousand, so let the feeding of the five thousand serve us as an example here.

Matt. xiv. 15.	Mark vi. 36.	Luke ix. 12.
ἀπολυσον τους ὀχλους,	ἀπολυσον αὐτους,	ἀπολυσον τον ὀχλον,
ἱνα ἀπελθοντες	ἱνα ἀπελθοντες	ἱνα πορευθεντες
εἰς τας	εἰς τους	εἰς τας
	κυκλῳ	κυκλῳ
	ἀγρους	κωμας

Matt. xiv. 15.	Mark vi. 36.	Luke ix. 12.
κωμας	και κωμας	και τους αγρους
αγορασωσιν ἑαυτοις	αγορασωσιν ἑαυτοις	καταλυσωσι και
		εὑρωσι
βρωματα.	ἀρτους,	ἐπισιτισμον,
	τι γαρ φαγωσιν οὐκ	ὁτι ἐν ἐρημῳ τοπῳ
	ἐχουσι.	ἐσμεν.
Ὁ δε Ἰησους εἰπεν αὐτοις	Ὁ δε ἀποκριθεις εἰπεν αὐτοις,	Εἰπε δε προς αὐτους,
οὐ χρειαν ἐχουσιν		
ἀπελθειν,		
δοτε αὐτοις ὑμεις	δοτε αὐτοις ὑμεις	δοτε αὐτοις ὑμεις
φαγειν·	φαγειν·	φαγειν·
λαβων τους πεντε	λαβων τους πεντε	λαβων τους πεντε
ἀρτους	ἀρτους	ἀρτους
και δυο ἰχθυας,	και τους δυο ἰχθυας,	και τους δυο ἰχθυας,
ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον	ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον	ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον
οὐρανον,	οὐρανον,	οὐρανον,
εὐλογησε,	εὐλογησε,	εὐλογησεν αὐτους
κλασας	και κατεκλασε	και κατεκλασε,
	τους ἀρτους,	
ἐδωκε	ἐδιδου	ἐδιδου
τοις μαθηταις	τοις μαθηταις,	τοις μαθηταις,
τους ἀρτους,		
οἱ δε μαθηται τοις	ἱνα παραδωσιν	παρατιθεναι τῳ
ὀχλοις.	αὐτοις.	ὀχλῳ.

Matt. xxvi. 18.	Mark xiv. 13.	Luke xxii. 10.
ὑπαγετε εἰς την πολιν,	ἀπαντησει ὑμιν ἀνθρωπος,	συναντησει ὑμιν ἀνθρωπος,
προς τον δεῖνα,	κεραμιον ὑδατος	κεραμιον ὑδατος
	βασταζων,	βασταζων,
	ἀκολουθησατε αὐτῳ,	ἀκολουθησατε αὐτῳ,
	και ὁπου εαν εἰσελθῃ,	εἰς την οἰκιαν οὐ εἰσπορευε-
		ται,
και εἰπατε αὐτῳ,	εἰπατε τῳ οἰκοδεσποτῃ,	και ἐρειτε τῳ οἰκοδεσποτῃ
		της οἰκιας,
ὁ διδασκαλος λεγει	ὁτι ὁ διδασκαλος λεγει	λεγει σοι ὁ διδασκαλος
ὁ καιρος μου ἐγγυς	που ἐστι το καταλυμα,	που ἐστι το καταλυμα,
ἐστιν,		
προς σε ποιω το πασχα,	ὁπου το πασχα	ὁπου το πασχα
μετα των μαθητων	μετα των μαθητων	μετα των μαθητων
μου.	μου φαγω;	μου φαγω;

Matt. xxvi. 18.	Mark xiv. 13.	Luke xxii. 10.
και ἑποιησαν οἱ μαθηται ὡς συνεταξεν αὐτοις Ἰησους, και ἡτοιμασαν το πασχα.	και αὐτος ὑμιν δειξει ἀνωγεον μεγα ἐστρωμενον ἑτοιμον, ἐκει ἑτοιμασατε ἡμιν.	κἀκεινος ὑμιν δειξει ἀνωγεον μεγα ἐστρωμενο ν ἐκει ἑτοιμασατε.

Luke xviii. 18.	Mark x. 17.
ἐπηρωτησε αὐτον διδασκαλε ἀγαθε, τι ποιησας ζωην αἰωνιον κληρονομησω; εἰπε δε αὐτῳ ὁ Ἰησους, τι με λεγεις ἀγαθον; οὐδεις ἀγαθος, εἰ μη εἰς, ὁ Θεος. τας ἐντολας οἰδας; μη μοιχευσης, μη φονευσης, μη κλεψης, μη ψευδομαρτυρησης, τιμᾶ τον πατερα σου και την μητερα σου. Ὁ δε εἰπε, ταυτα παντα ἐφυλαξαμην ἐκ νεοτητος μου· ἀκουσας δε ὁ Ἰησους εἰπεν αὐτῳ, ἐτι ἐν σοι λειπει, παντα ὁσα ἐχεις πωλησον, και διαδος πτωχοις, και ἐξεις θησαυρον ἐν οὐρανῳ, και δευρο ἀκολουθει μοι. ὁ Ἰησους . . . εἰπε, πως δυσκολως οἱ τα χρηματα ἐχοντες εἰσελευσονται εἰς την βασιλειαν του Θεου; εὐκοπωτερον γαρ ἐστι	ἐπηρωτᾳ αὐτον, διδασκαλε ἀγαθε, τι ποιησω ἱνα ζωην αἰωνιον κληρονομησω; ὁ δε Ἰησους εἰπεν αὐτῳ, τι με λεγεις ἀγαθον; οὐδεις ἀγαθος, εἰ μη εἰς, ὁ Θεος. τας ἐντολας οἰδας; μη μοιχευσης, μη φονευσης, μη κλεψης, μη ψευδομαρτυρησης, μη ἀποστερησης, τιμᾶ τον πατερα σου, και την μητερα. Ὁ δε ἀποκριθεις εἰπεν αὐτῳ, διδασκαλε, ταυτα παντα ἐφυλαξαμην ἐκ νεοτητος μου· ὁ δε Ἰησους ἐμβλεψας αὐτῳ ἠγαπησεν αὐτον, και εἰπεν αὐτῳ ἐν σοι ὑστερει, ὑπαγε· ὁσα ἐχεις πωλησον, και δος τοις πτωχοις, και ἐξεις θησαυρον ἐν οὐρανῳ, και δευρο ἀκολουθει μοι. ὁ Ἰησους . . . . . λεγει, πως δυσκολως οἱ τα χρηματα ἐχοντες εἰσελευσονται εἰς την βασιλειαν του Θεου; εὐκοπωτερον ἐστι

Luke. xviii. 18.	Mark x. 17.
καμηλον δια τρυμαλιας ραφιδος εισελθειν, ἡ πλουσιον εις την βασιλειαν του Θεου εισελθειν.	καμηλον δια της τρυμαλιας της ραφιδος διελθειν, ἡ πλουσιον εις την βασιλειαν του Θεου εισελθειν.

This last passage, like several others, is perfectly adapted to display the gradation, in which the Evangelists advance, by the assistance of Matthew. Mark adheres much more closely to Matthew than Luke: hence he still retains, among other things, ὑστερει, where Luke uses ἐν σοι λειπει, δος where the other uses διαδος, and ὑπαγε before ὁσα ἐχεις which Luke omits. But where Mark deviates from Matthew and pursues his own way, (as for instance, in the beginning and in the representation of the precepts which appear according to an idiomatic peculiarity in the futurum conjunctivum, and towards the end,) Luke concurs with Mark even to the least minutiæ, and it is evident that he is one of those authors, whose previous existence Luke mentioned in his prologue.

We now produce a few of those passages, to which there is nothing similar in Matthew.

Mark i. 24, 25.	Luke iv. 34, 35.
Ἑα, τι ἡμιν και σοι, Ἰησου Ναζαρηνε; ἡλθες ἀπολεσαι ἡμας. οἰδα σε τις εἰ, Ὁ ἁγιος του Θεου· και ἐπετιμησεν αὐτῳ ὁ Ἰησους λεγων· φιμωθητι, και ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτου.	Ἑα, τι ἡμιν και σοι, Ἰησου Ναζαρηνε; ἡλθες ἀπολεσαι ἡμας. οἰδα σε τις εἰ, Ὁ ἁγιος του Θεου· και ἐπετιμησεν αὐτῳ ὁ Ἰησους λεγων· φιμωθητι, και ἐξελθε ἐξ αὐτου.

MARK x. 14, 15.

ἀφετε τα παιδια
ἐρχεσθαι προς με,
και μη κωλυετε αὐτα·
των γαρ τοιουτων ἐστιν
ἡ βασιλεια του Θεου·
ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν,
ὸς ἐαν μη δεξηται
την βασιλειαν του Θεου,
ὡς παιδιον,
οὐ μη εἰσελθῃ εἰς αὐτην.

LUKE XVIII. 16, 17.

ἀφετε τα παιδια
ἐρχεσθαι προς με,
και μη κωλυετε αὐτα·
των γαρ τοιουτων ἐστιν
ἡ βασιλεια του Θεου·
ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν,
ὸς ἐαν μη δεξηται
την βασιλειαν του Θεου,
ὡς παιδιον,
οὐ μη εἰσελθῃ εἰς αὐτην.

MARK XII. 38, 39, 40.

ἀπο των Γραμματεων
των θελοντων
ἐν στολαις
περιπατειν, και

ἀσπασμους
ἐν ταις ἀγοραις,
και πρωτοκαθεδρας ἐν ταις
συναγωγαις, και πρωτοκλισιας
ἐν τοις δειπνοις,
οἱ κατεσθιοντες
τας οἰκιας των χηρων,
και προφασει μακρα
προσευχομενοι·
οὐτοι ληψονται
περισσοτερον κριμα.

LUKE XXII. 46, 47.

ἀπο των Γραμματεων
των θελοντων
περιπατειν
ἐν στολαις και
φιλουντων
ἀσπασμους
ἐν ταις ἀγοραις,
και πρωτοκαθεδρας ἐν ταις
συναγωγαις, και πρωτοκλισιας
ἐν τοις δειπνοις,
οἱ κατεσθιοντες
τας οἰκιας των χηρων,
και προφασει μακρα
προσευχονται·
οὐτοι ληψονται
περισσοτερον κριμα.

SECTION XXXVII.

BUT the conclusion which we draw from such appearances, that one author had read the other and transcribed passages from him into his work, some are inclined to ascribe to totally different causes. Several of these, for instance, according to the pro-

position of a scholar whom we have before mentioned with respect, are said, by means of interpolations, to have been inserted from one Gospel into the other, for the purpose of completing it from the other [m]. Besides some of the passages already mentioned, this accusation is brought against

Matt. viii. 19—22.	Luke ix. 57.—x.
Matt. xi. 21. 28.	Luke x. 12—23.
Matt. xii. 39—43.	Luke xi. 29—32.
Matt. xxiv. 45—51.	Luke xii. 42—48, &c.

Considered as interpolations they are not illustrations of obscure words; embellishments of harsh and barbarous Grecian phrases; explanations of difficult sentences by a collation of similar expressions, or, as they are called, parallel passages; interpolations which are known to us, and which were also known to the ancients; but a peculiar sort, of which criticism furnishes no examples.

The passages in question have in an analogous series of sentences now and then small, and also sometimes greater dissimilarities in the expression; they want individual parts of the discourse, or they are separated from each other by transpositions, they are interrupted by inserted additions, and mostly introduced in the books of Matthew and Luke, in an entirely different connection.

According to this form and treatment, they are not interpolations, but they bear the character of remodelling the historical materials. For the sake of greater explicitness, we must adduce an example: let it be the second of those before mentioned;

[m] Gratz's New Essay, in explanation of the origin of the three Gospels, Sect. 36.

Matt. xi. 21—28. Luke x. 12—23., where Luke is said to be interpolated from Matthew [n].

Matthew begins οὐαι σοι, Χοραζιν; but Luke prefixes the twenty-fourth verse of Matthew: λεγω ὑμιν ὁτι Σοδομοις, &c. The first says γῃ Σοδομων ἀνεκτοτερον ἐσται ἐν ἡμερᾳ κρισεως ἢ σοι; the other, Σοδομοις ἐν τῃ ἡμερᾳ ἐκεινῃ ἀνεκτοτερον ἐσται, ἢ τῃ πολει ἐκεινῃ. The words, οὐαι σοι, Χοραζιν, Matthew concludes και σποδῳ μετενοησαν; Luke και σποδῳ καθημεναι μετενοησαν. After και συ, Καπερναουμ ..... καταβιβασθησῃ, the subsequent part ὁτι εἰ ἐν Σοδομοις to της σημερον is wanting in Luke. Immediately upon this, Luke separates the sentences of Matthew by the intermediate return of the Seventy, verse 17, and unites with this other sentences, 18, 19, 20., with which Matthew is not acquainted. But then, he returns again to Matthew, who expresses himself thus: ἐν ἐκεινῳ τῳ καιρῳ ἀποκριθεις ὁ Ἰησους εἰπεν· ἐξομολογονμαι σοι, πατερ· λ. Luke instead of this makes the transition ἐν αὐτῃ τῃ ὡρᾳ ἠγγαλιασατο τῳ πνευματι ὁ Ἰησους, και εἰπεν, ἐξομολογουμαι σοι, πατερ, and continues uniformly with Matthew 25, 26, 27., as far as ἀποκαλυψαι. Thence forward the similarity ceases, and the fine sentences in Matthew xi. 28, 29, 30., are no longer to be found in Luke. Instead of them he joins sentences together, which Matthew in another place, xiii. 16, 17., puts into the mouth of our Lord, when the disciples besought him to explain some parabolical discourses.

If they had thus designed to interpolate Luke from Matthew, or in other words, to complete him, the sentences in question must have been inserted after the narrative in Luke vii. 24—35. after the words και ἐδικαιωθη ἡ σοφια, etc., for they stand in

[n] Gratz's New Essay, in explanation of the origin of the three Gospels, § 36. p. 144.

Matthew in that situation, xi. 19., and they are here wanting in Luke. Other speeches transferred from Matthew xiii. 16, 17., should have occupied their place in Luke viii. 10., after μη συνιωσι, for to that they belong according to Matthew, and there they are omitted by Luke. Why the bandage is placed by the side of the wound, why the insertion is made in quite different places to those, in which the completion should be undertaken, this hypothesis does not explain, consequently, it is useless, in all those cases, where a transposition has occurred in another connection. From this view of the subject we collect the following remarks. A part of the materials, of which this paragraph consists, is to be found in Matthew, although dispersed in different places; but in Luke it is more arbitrarily arranged: the connection is interrupted by parentheses; something is placed before or after it according to his judgment; some part of it is omitted; the greatest part is differently applied; some alterations are made in the expression; and all is exactly as we have observed at first. We therefore do not here meet with insertions only, such as are usual, but traits which demonstrate a free treatment in the composition and arrangement of the historical matter, and an arbitrary management of a subject. As the same observations in other paragraphs, more or less recur, this assertion proportionably applies to them.

The ordinary signs of interpolation; that which is inadmissible, and not to be reconciled in the representations; the want of order in the train of thought, and the want of arrangement in the separate parts, or unconnectedness, interruption, violation of plan proposed, do not appear in the account of Luke. We should much rather be-

lieve that this section had so stood for ever in his book.

The mission and return of the Seventy, Luke x. 1. are the facts, with which the passages of Matthew here censured are connected. The denunciation against the unbelief of the cities, in which Jesus had performed so many proofs of his Divine mission could hardly stand in a more suitable connection than it stands in Luke, where our Lord sends forth the Seventy with full authority, and prepares them for the wicked violence, which they would encounter in some places, verse 10, 11. The menaced punishment of these refractory cities is here naturally united in the train of thought and enters into the connection.

The thankfulness of Jesus, ὁμολογουμαι σοι πατερ, could no where be better excited and pronounced than at the sight of the disciples, who, just returning from their first attempt at teaching, declared their joy at their success. Could a more suitable opportunity for the words be conceived? I praise thee, Father, that thou hast revealed to these youths what thou hast concealed from the wise? &c.

And as a continuation of this idea these words immediately follow: Blessed are your eyes which see, what prophets and kings have wished to see in vain! x. 23, 24.

Where so much conformity of the parts to the whole, and such a judicious agreement uniformly prevails, no reasonable supposition of interpolation can fall on the narrative of Luke. If one of the two authors is interpolated, it must rather be Matthew. But why was not the whole history of the mission and return of the Seventy, to which these instructions and words are annexed, (as members to their body) given to Matthew? Why have

MATT. XIV. 15.	MARK VI. 36.	LUKE IX. 12.
κωμας	και κωμας	και τους αγρους
αγορασωσιν ἑαυτοις	αγορασωσιν ἑαυτοις	καταλυσωσι και
		εὑρωσι
βρωματα.	ἀρτους,	ἐπισιτισμον,
	τι γαρ φαγωσιν οὐκ	ὁτι ἐν ἐρημῳ τοπῳ
	ἐχουσι.	ἐσμεν.
Ὁ δε Ἰησους εἰπεν αὐτοις	Ὁ δε ἀποκριθεις εἰπεν αὐτους,	Εἰπε δε προς αὐτους,
οὐ χρειαν ἐχουσιν		
ἀπελθειν,		
δοτε αὐτοις ὑμεις	δοτε αὐτοις ὑμεις	δοτε αὐτοις ὑμεις
φαγειν·	φαγειν·	φαγειν·
λαβων τους πεντε	λαβων τους πεντε	λαβων τους πεντε
ἀρτους	ἀρτους	ἀρτους
και δυο ἰχθυας,	και τους δυο ἰχθυας,	και τους δυο ἰχθυας,
ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον	ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον	ἀναβλεψας εἰς τον
οὐρανον,	οὐρανον,	οὐρανον,
εὐλογησε,	εὐλογησε,	εὐλογησεν αὐτους
κλασας	και κατεκλασε	και κατεκλασε,
	τους ἀρτους,	
ἐδωκε	ἐδιδου	ἐδιδου
τοις μαθηταις	τοις μαθηταις,	τοις μαθηταις,
τους ἀρτους,		
οἱ δε μαθηται τοις	ἱνα παραδωσιν	παρατιθεναι τῳ
ὀχλοις.	αὐτοις.	ὀχλῳ.

MATT. XXVI. 18.	MARK XIV. 13.	LUKE XXII. 10.
ὑπαγετε εἰς την πολιν,	ἀπαντησει ὑμιν ἀνθρωπος,	συναντησει ὑμιν ἀνθρωπος,
προς τον δεῖνα,	κεραμιον ὑδατος	κεραμιον ὑδατος
	βασταζων,	βασταζων,
	ἀκολουθησατε αὐτῳ,	ἀκολουθησατε αὐτῳ,
	και ὁπου εαν εἰσελθῃ,	εἰς την οἰκιαν οὐ εἰσπορευε-
		ται,
και εἰπατε αὐτῳ,	εἰπατε τῳ οἰκοδεσποτῃ,	και ἐρειτε τῳ οἰκοδεσποτῃ
		της οἰκιας,
ὁ διδασκαλος λεγει	ὁτι ὁ διδασκαλος λεγει	λεγει σοι ὁ διδασκαλος
ὁ καιρος μου ἐγγυς	που ἐστι το καταλυμα,	που ἐστι το καταλυμα,
ἐστιν,		
προς σε ποιω το πασχα,	ὁπου το πασχα	ὁπου το πασχα
μετα των μαθητων	μετα των μαθητων	μετα των μαθητων
μου.	μου φαγω ;	μου φαγω;

members of the narrative, until three authors different in genius and character would become no longer like to themselves, but each like to the other. A strange and ill-conceived desire, the idea of which, the ancients would have probably prevented, if they were able to oppose it.

There is but little difference between this and Semler's hypothesis of the conformation or similar construction, which a writer of uncommon learning having lately recommended, has again brought to our recollection[p]. It differs only in the object, which has occasioned and directed a similar attempt. As in the former one Gospel was interpolated from the other to complete it, so, in the latter they were stimulated by the desire of rendering them mutually consonant.

But if the necessity of such an undertaking was really felt, there was no important cause why the office should be commenced by such passages, whilst others required an urgent precaution, since sceptics and opponents might from these accuse the Gospels of real or apparent contradictions, or dispute their historical veracity. Nevertheless, the passages of this description which contain real or apparent contradictions (by the opponents they were accounted real) have remained untouched in the Gospels. With so little obtrusiveness did they conduct themselves, that they allowed the objections against the Gospels to remain in them and rather exposed themselves to the danger of not being able to answer them, than they would venture to harmonize them by a few strokes of the pen.

If then they did not do that, which was the most urgent and the most necessary, much less did

[p] Bertholdt's Hist. Crit. Introduction to the writings of the Old and New Testament, part iii. § 329. p. 1249.

they trouble themselves about that which was synonymous and accidental. Admitting also that they, without experiencing its necessity, amused themselves with producing conformation, yet even in those passages, to which the hypothesis is said to be applicable, the conformity has become unequal.

The same instances which the preceding hypothesis is intended to explain, are also the object of the present. All the observations, therefore, which we have before made, again require our attention. The passages which we would impart to the one historian from the store of the other for the sake of producing uniformity, are not inserted in the places, where the other has stated them. Single sentences are often transposed at pleasure, and misplaced in one way or the other, they are repeatedly interrupted by parentheses, and some are entirely or partially omitted. In the use of words a dissimilarity remains, which, where conformation was designed, should have been removed without scruple. How then can we hence draw any conclusion in favour of attempts at conformation?

SECTION XXXVIII.

But what is the reason that these authors, of whom the latter is said to have had the former before him, and to have incorporated whole passages from him into his book, did not always transcribe the passages word for word, that they repeated each other's words, in some sentences, to the very letters; that they then digress, differ from each other, again agree together, and continue alike? This question, it is maintained, is not to be solved,

unless we have recourse to copies of Hebrew original Gospels, and if these be not sufficient, to Hebrew original Gospels with Greek translations, from which our historians drew their materials. This question was the pretended occasion, and at the same time the prop of the multiform hypotheses known on the subject. What therefore is indeed the cause of these variations? The answer is very ready; because these authors in making use of each other did not give up their individuality: I have made use of a scholastic expression, because it strikingly defines my meaning.

Some have taken away from them their independence, and denied their freedom of choosing an expression, which was more usual to them, or occurred more appropriately, instead of the other, and consequently, have imputed to them the awkwardness in translating, from which they ingeniously hoped to elucidate these differences; when this, however, was insufficient, they tacitly took away from them even this defective talent of translation, and placed before them versions of the original Gospels already made, for transcription, in which these dissimilarities already existed. Thus are they by degrees degraded to mere copyists, as if it were an uncritical requisition to grant to them a will of their own.

Yet the variations in the book of each individual Evangelist have a peculiar character, which upon the whole continues uniform, whence we might undoubtedly have inferred that each was the work of one individual. In Mark these scattered passages are adapted to exhibit in few words the feelings and ideas, the appearance and demeanour of the persons who are the agents. The single verse of Mark x. 16. gives us a complete description: let us see on the

contrary, Matt. xix. 15. To Matt. xix. 20., he has added after νεοτητος μου the words x. 21.; ὁ δε Ἰησους ἐμβλεψας αὐτῳ, ἠγαπησεν αὐτον, και εἰπεν, which communicates to the narrative an unexpected grace and power of representation. In the same chapter x. 14. (of Matt. xix. 14.) he adds the instantaneous burst of feeling; ἠγανακτησε και εἰπεν, just as Mark viii. 2. Matt. xii. 39. and elsewhere: ὁ δε Ἰησους σπλαγχνισθεις, Mark i. 41. (of Matt. viii. 3.) and still further, iii. 5. Matt. xii. 10, 11. και περιβλεψαμενος μετ' ὀργης, and ἡ δε γυνη φοβηθεισα και τρεμουσα, v. 33. Matt. ix. 22. ἀποβαλων το ἱματιον αὐτου; ἀναστας ἠλθε· x. 50. Matt. xx. 32. or also the violent state of a sufferer, and the opinion of the spectators respecting it; ix. 20 and 26. Matt. xvii. 18. also Mark x. 32. Matt. xx. 17. and the like. How he could so speak of things not having himself seen them, we shall not consider in this place; but still it is pleasant herein also to recognize the voucher of the author, and to find anew the confirmation, that Mark did not receive the accounts from a second and third hand, but wrote down the declaration of an eye-witness, who preserved the picture of that which had happened in a vigorous imagination, and, as he scattered over the narrative some select features from a renewed association with him, so also, he occasionally recalled to mind the particular Aramæan word, with which our Lord is said to have caused a miracle to take place: how he exclaimed *Talitha kumi*, that is, *Maiden, arise;* and to the deaf and dumb *Ephphatha*, which is, be opened. Mark v. 41. vii. 34.

But if he only varies in the expressions, adds words, changes them for others, enlarges sentences, or introduces perhaps something between them, it arises from the care for explicitness and accuracy which is manifested in it. This care induced him

to add to Matt. iii. 6. ἐν τῷ Ἰορδανῃ the word ποταμῳ; i. 5., or to το ὑδωρ, Matt. viii. 4. περι του καθαρισμου. i. 44. He inserts, l. 42. εἰποντος αὐτου, to intimate the instantaneousness of the result. In the second chapter (verse 8 and 16., then 18., and 21., το καινον του παλαιου,) there are changes and amplifications for the sake of distinctness. Verse iii. 30. is an explanatory addition to Matt. xii. 31, 32. just as vi. 18. explains Matt. xiv. 4. οὐκ ἐξεστι σοι ἐχειν αὐτην. Such also, are Mark vii. 19. οὐκ εἰς την καρδιαν, Matt. xv. 17., Matt. xvi. 9, 10. ποσους κοφινους. Mark viii. 19, 20. πληρεις κλασματων. Mark is explanatory, in xii. 26. ἐπι του βατου and xiii. 3. κατεναντι του ἱερου, by which it becomes intelligible how the conversation is resumed, also, in xiv. 12., ὁτι το πασχα ἔθυον' (cf Matt. xxvi. 17., also Mark xiv. 56, 57. Matt. xxvi. 60, 61.) and περικαλυπτειν το προσωπον, xiv. 65., without which προφητευσον, in Matt. xxvi. 68. would be unintelligible.

In Luke we observe an attempt to be more concise in his expressions.

Mark i. 22. Luke iv. 32.
ὁτι ἐν ἐξουσιᾳ ἠν ὁ λογος αὐτου.
Mark i. 28. Luke iv. 37,
και ἐξεπορευετο ἠχος περι αὐτου εἰς παντα τοπον της περιχωρου.
Mark ii. 15, 16. Luke v. 29. 30.
Mark iii. 31—35. Luke viii. 19—21.
Mark iv. 5—9. Luke viii. 6—8.
Mark ix. 6. Luke ix. 33.
μη εἰδως ὁ λεγει.
Mark iv. 30—32. Luke xiii. 18, 19.
Mark v. 2—15. Luke viii. 27—34.
Mark xi. 15, 16, 17. Luke xix. 45, 46.
Mark xiii. 1, 2. Luke xxi. 5, 6.

Mark xiv. 16. Luke xxii. 13.
ἀπελθοντες δε εὑρον καθως εἰρηκεν αὐτοις.

Luke is still farther distinguished by his attention to more elegant diction. How harsh is the sentence of Mark xii. 38. των θελοντων ἐν στολαις περιπατειν και ἀσπασμους ἐν ταις ἀγοραις? Luke inserts a single word: και φιλουντων ἀσπασμους, and now the sentence displays ease and roundness. The passage in Matt. viii. 9. ἀνθρωπος εἰμι ὑπο ἐξουσιαν, ἐχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτον στρατιωτας, is not only harsh but also obscure, and has misled some of the ancient translators; Luke perfectly remedies it by the insertion of one word, ὑπο ἐξουσιαν τασσομενος. vii. 8. The phrase, in Matt. xxi. 26. παντες γαρ ἐχουσι Ἰωαννην ὡς προφητην, is not pure Greek; Mark xi. 32. endeavours to remedy it: Luke differs from both, for the sake of giving to the sentence a fine Hellenic turn; ὁ λαος—πεπεισμενος ἐστιν, Ἰωαννην προφητην εἰναι. xx. 6.: in the same manner he models Matt. xi. 8. οἱ μαλακα φορουντες, for the sake of obtaining correctness and elegance, οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῳ ἐνδοξῳ και τρυφῃ ὑπαρχοντες. vii. 25. For ὑπηρετης Matt. v. 25. Luke xii. 56. substitutes the legal expression πρακτωρ. In Mark xii. 44. Luke's (xxi. 4.) construction is more conformable to the Greek idiom: αὐτη δε ἐκ του ὑστερηματος αὐτης ἁπαντα τον βιον ὑν εἰχεν ἐβαλε. Sometimes also he avoids a Hebraism: ἐαν κερδησῃ τον κοσμον ὁλον και ζημιωθῃ την ψυχην αὐτου, Mark viii. 36. which Luke ix. 25. renders κερδησας τον κοσμον ὁλον, ἐαυτον (נַפְשׁוֹ) δε ἀπολεσας, ἠ ζημιωθεις. Mark xii. 20, 21, 22. οὐκ ἀφηκε σπερμα. Luke xx. 28, 29. ἀπεθανεν ἀτεκνως. Or Matt. viii. 27. ἐθαυμασαν, Mark iv. 41. ἐφοβηθησαν φοβον μεγαν, where he not only avoids the Hebraism, but beautifully unites the two words, viii. 25. φοβηθεντες δε ἐθαυμασαν.

The constantly recurring εὐθεως και εὐθεως, belongs to the ordinary peculiarities of Mark; not much less frequently does παραχρημα occur in Luke instead of it, as well in the Gospel as in the Acts of the Apostles: just as the frequent use of the particle, τοτε, is a peculiarity of Matthew. Among the peculiarities of Matthew we may also reckon ἀποκριθεις, without a preceding question, Matt. xi. 25., xvii. 4., xxii. 1., xxviii. 5., then the continually recurring ἀμην λεγω ὑμιν, where Luke merely uses, λεγω ὑμιν: or says also, ἀληθως λεγω ὑμιν, Luke ix. 27., xii. 44. xxi. 3., and, ἐπ' ἀληθειας λεγω ὑμιν, iv. 24. The individuality of these authors is so apparent, that it does not require such great preparations to render it conceivable how, in the middle of a series of parallel passages, one of them could change the expression, introduce words, insert little interruptions, and, in short, follow himself, and his own habits.

SECTION XXXIX.

In the position of the events Luke coincides with Mark against the arrangement of facts and the order of Matthew, from whence it is confirmed that Mark laboured on Matthew with regard to the succession of time, and proposed more strictly to observe it, since Luke, also, as he announces his intention at the opening of his book, reckoned the natural course of events among his *(historical)* duties.

THE FIRST JOURNEY.

LUKE.	MARK.
I. Jesus goes to Capernaum, cures a Dæmoniac.	I. Jesus goes to Capernaum, cures a Dæmoniac.
II. He goes into the house of Simon.	II. He goes into the house of Simon.
III. He goes into Simon's ship, who had toiled all night and caught nothing.	
IV. He cures a Leper.	III. He cures a Leper.

THE SECOND JOURNEY.

LUKE.	MARK.
I. Four men bring one sick of the palsy.	I. Four men bring one sick of the palsy.
II. Jesus calls Levi.	II. Jesus calls Levi.
III. The disciples of John fast.	III. The disciples of John fast.
IV. The disciples of Jesus go through the cornfields.	IV. The disciples of Jesus go through the cornfields.

THE THIRD JOURNEY.

LUKE.	MARK.
I. A man with a withered hand is cured.	I. A man with a withered hand is cured.
II. Jesus chooses the twelve.	II. Jesus chooses the twelve.
III. He cures the servant of the Centurion.	
IV. Jesus comes to Nain, raises the son of the widow.	
V. The disciples of John ask whether Jesus is the expected Messiah.	
VI. The sinful woman in the house of the Pharisee anoints Jesus.	
VII. Jesus cures Dæmoniacs, instructs them respecting the parable of the Sower.	III. Jesus is accused of curing through Beelzebub.
VIII. The mother and the brethren of Jesus come.	IV. The mother and the brethren of Jesus come: he instructs them concerning the parable of the Sower.

LUKE.	MARK.
IX. Jesus sleeps during the storm, comes to Gadaris. The history of the Dæmoniac.	V. Jesus sleeps during the storm, comes to Gadaris. The history of the Dæmoniac.
X. Jesus cures the daughter of Jairus.	VI. Jesus cures the daughter of Jairus.

In the first journey, the account in No. III. is quite peculiar to Luke, and not at all touched upon by Mark, and the account likewise in No. IV., in the third journey, exclusively belongs to him. The incidents in No. III. and IV., in this same journey, are indeed mentioned by Matthew; but Mark has separated them from their place and not introduced them again. The conduct of Luke, who links them with entirely different occurrences, and in a different period, perfectly justifies Mark for having separated them from this connection. John xii. 1. has again narrated the event in number vi., where he unites the circumstances which Mark and Luke have separately detailed, and even their words into one narrative, from which we learn that the narrative in Mark xiv. 3. and that in Luke vii. 36. are one single fact.

The accusation, that Jesus cures through Beelzebub, Luke mentions farther back in the course of the history, xi. 14.? but in the place where it appears in Mark he speaks generally, of the cure of persons possessed with Devils, through the miraculous power of Jesus. Mark next has united the parables of the sower and the mustard seed. Luke separates them

and details the second by itself in a later connection. xiii. 17—21.

In regard to the circumstance of the Centurion, he adduces the reason of the order in which it occurs; for he fixes the time and says, after this had happened Jesus went the following day to Nain, vii. 11. ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς. The enquiry of the disciples of John, which in Matthew stands quite isolated xi. 11. Luke joins to the resuscitation of the youth at Nain, and mentions this occurrence as the cause which induced John to send his disciples to make the enquiry, Luke vii. 17. It is also clear from the answer of Jesus himself in Matthew, that the miracle of the resuscitation of the dead person preceded it: for Jesus refers to it in Matt. ix. 5.; Tell him, "The blind see, the lame walk, the dead are raised." Luke consequently has arranged these narratives on chronological principles, and that which Mark has omitted in the order of facts in Matthew without elsewhere inserting it, he has again received, representing it however differently, and according to the true order of time.

This moreover appears from a circumstance, which Matthew misplaces in the first period of the ministry of Jesus, viii. 19., and describes immediately after the visit to Peter's house. For, an individual was desirous of following Jesus, but was first informed of the difficulties of this intention. Mark has laid aside this account as well as the preceding, which is not placed in its chronological order: but Luke assigns to this event both time and place, and removes it far back in the course of the history, making it happen on the road, ix. 52. 57., when Jesus being desirous of going to Jerusalem, ix. 51., passed through Samaria. That he next separates the parables of the sower and the mustard

seed, which seem, on account of their similarity, to have been united in Mark, and assigns to them different places in his book, we can only explain by attention to the order of time. But on the other hand one fact, vii. 37. viz. the history of the sinful woman, who anointed Jesus, is placed too early, of which we shall be convinced by a comparison with John.

In the FOURTH JOURNEY they again proceed uniformly with each other as we see here;

LUKE.	MARK.
I. Jesus calls the twelve and assembles them.	I. Jesus calls the twelve and assembles them.
II. Herod believes that John had risen.	II. Herod believes that John had risen.
III. The disciples of Jesus return from their mission.	III. The disciples of Jesus return from their mission.
IV. Five thousand are fed.	IV. Five thousand are fed.

SECTION XL.

Henceforward, however, Luke leaves out a whole series of events which are found both in Matthew and Mark; but soon after he again joins them, and accompanies them step by step.

The events omitted are the following: the disciples of Jesus are on the sea; their Master ap-

pears to them; goes to them in the ship; and they arrive at Gennesareth; Mark vi. 45., Matt. xiv. 23. The Pharisees blame the disciples of Jesus for eating with unwashed hands, Mark vii. 1. Jesus arrives at the borders of Tyre, and heals the daughter of the believing Canaanitish woman, vii. 24. Jesus cures a deaf and dumb person with spittle, vii. 31. Four thousand are fed, viii. 1. The Pharisees demand a sign of Jesus: the disciples are warned against the leaven of the Pharisees: a blind man is healed, viii. 22.

All this is wanting in Luke; but now again he proceeds uniformly with the others.

LUKE.	MARK.
I. Jesus asks, for whom they take him?	I. Jesus asks, for whom they take him?
II. He is transfigured on the Mount.	II. He is transfigured on the Mount.
III. The disciples are not able to cure a Dæmoniac.	III. The disciples are not able to cure a Dæmoniac.
IV. They contend who shall be the greatest in the kingdom of God.	IV. They contend who shall be the greatest in the kingdom of God.
V. John relates, that a person is curing Dæmoniacs in the name of Jesus.	V. John relates, that a person is curing Dæmoniacs in the name of Jesus.

It is contrary to the custom of this author to omit any circumstance entirely; he always takes up those narratives of Matthew which were excluded from Mark, and inserts them again in the course of the history in another place and passage. From hence, consequently, the phænomenon in question is not to be explained.

But if we follow the track of the deviating part in Luke's history we observe, that he has removed from hence the occurrence with those who demanded a sign, and placed it farther down in the last times, xi. 29., and that he has inserted, still farther back, the admonition against the leaven of the Pharisees, in another connexion, xii. 1.

With the exception of these events, the series of facts differing in Luke from the other Evangelists is concluded with the feeding of the four thousand; but that which immediately precedes this succession of facts terminated with the feeding of the five thousand. Luke ix. 12—18., then unites with the miracle of the five thousand, that, which in the other Evangelists, immediately follows the subsequent feeding of the four thousand, Matt. xv. 32., xvi. 13. Mark viii. 1—27. We have consequently here a *Homoioteleuton*, whence this phænomenon may be explained.

That this part of the history was lost at a very early period we may infer from the fact that it has not been preserved in one single copy. If the copies had already been extensively circulated, the error would not have thus been committed every where, and it would, at least in some country or other, or in some manuscript or other, have been rescued from destruction.

We have probably, thereby not only lost that with which we are already acquainted by his prede-

cessors, in which case we might be indifferent respecting the loss,—but we have at the same time lost something of the adventures and instructions of Jesus, with which Luke has sometimes enriched his biography from his own store.

He acquaints us, in the Acts of the Apostles, with a doctrinal position of our Lord, xx. 25., δει μνημονευειν των λογων του Κυριου Ἰησου, ὁτι αὐτος εἰπε· μακαριον ἐστι διδοναι μαλλον ἠ λαμβανειν, concerning which he is silent in the Gospel: and it certainly was connected with some remarkable event, parable, or discourse, and would have become a peculiar embellishment to his history. It appears to me more credible, that this passage was comprised in that part of the history which is wanting, and shared the same fate with it, than that he should have neglected or omitted it.

There occur moreover in the oldest Ecclesiastical teachers, sentences which we seek in vain in our historical books, as for instance that in the epistle of Barnabas, c. 8. οὑτω φησι, οἱ ϑελοντες με ἰδειν, και ἁψασϑαι μου της βασιλειας, ὀφειλουσι ϑλιβοντες και παϑοντες λαβειν με; but I presume not to suppose that they were borrowed from thence.

SECTION XLI.

After this part of the history which is omitted, they unite again with each other, and Luke, as the table given in the preceding section shows, continues in the course of facts harmonizing with Mark. But this does not extend farther than we have there shown. Thenceforward Luke, for the most part, works independently of the others, and conducts us to quite new and hitherto unnoticed scenes. For

all the other Evangelists disclose the last journey of the passion; but Luke acts otherwise. He informs us three times that Jesus intended to go to Jerusalem, he likewise, for some way, describes to us each time the progress of the journey. But where we expect shortly to see Jesus in Jerusalem, contrary to our expectation we do not find him there, but in quite a different place, and indeed still farther back than he was at the beginning of his journey.

In chapter ix. 51. he begins his narrative by the introduction; when the days of his exaltation approached, his face was firmly set to go towards Jerusalem. Now Jesus went through Samaria, which was the road from Galilee for the pilgrim who visited Jerusalem. In Samaria his disciples wish to call down fire from heaven, x. 52—56. The narrative is then extended, until Jesus arrives at the residence of Martha and Mary, which according to the other Evangelists is Bethany, x. 38. Of Jerusalem itself Luke does not say a word; but speaks in general terms of the residence of Jesus, ἐν τοπῳ τινι. xi. 1., and informs us of a conversation respecting an event which according to all appearance happened in Jerusalem and at the feast. xiii. 1.

Unexpectedly, Jesus is again in Galilee and begins anew his journey thence to Jerusalem, (xiii. 22. ἡν πορειαν ποιουμενος εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ) and amidst a series of discourses and actions he thus advances[q]; but to the place itself, whither our Lord's object was directed, Luke, for the second time, does not conduct

[q] xvii. 11. is not a beginning of a new journey, but, as the words distinctly mean, only the continuation of that which had been commenced; ἐγενετο δε ἐν τῳ πορευεσθαι αὐτον εἰς Ἱερουσαλημ. This it was necessary to observe, that no doubt might hence arise.

him, but where he should appear there, he quite in a disjointed manner relates to us the project of a new journey to the holy city.

He took the twelve and said, "behold we go to Jerusalem!" xviii. 31. Now this journey proceeds on the other side of the Jordan, and Jesus arrives by way of Jericho, xviii. 35., at the capital and place of his death, which he now describes with the circumstances attending it.

We have here nothing but descriptions of journeys without knowing the issue, and that which previously happened in the place whither they were directed:—even without knowing whether the exalted traveller reached the place to which his views directed him. Here it appears, or rather it is clear, that we have before us no connected history, but detached parts and extracts, or, if we prefer the word, fragments and collectanea, which the author again gave to us, as his investigations offered them to him. Thus much can we as yet say of the plan and scheme of this book, and we now pass over to its composition in the individual parts.

SECTION XLII.

In the narratives which we find in common both in Matthew and Mark, he adheres to Mark in the detail of facts according to their particular circumstances. In the history of the woman with the flux, Mark places the miracle in a peculiar light, by acquainting us with the long and fruitless endeavours of the woman, her expences, and the attempts of the physicians to remedy this disorder; he adds the dia-

logue which arose between Jesus and the disciples respecting the woman touching him, describes her conduct more minutely, her fright and her perplexity, &c. According to all these circumstances, Luke also describes to us the proceeding, and in the description of her fright he uses an expression very similar to that of Mark.

Let us take the history of the daughter of Jairus which is united with it. In Matthew, ix. 18. the *Ruler* says at his very first approach; "My daughter is dead[r]." In Mark, v. 23. she is only at the point of death, and *not until* he had continued the intermediate history of the woman with the flux, did the messengers announcing her death arrive; Jesus on hearing this account encourages the father, &c. In the same manner also Luke states the whole, viii. 40. cf. Matt. viii. 1—5. Mark i. 40. to ii. Luke v. 12—17. Matt. ix. 1—8. Mark ii. 3—13. Luke v. 18—27. Matt. xvii. 14—19. Mark ix. 14—30. Luke ix. 37—43., &c.

He also receives, in their full number, the more minute accounts, to which Mark attended more strictly than Matthew, and thus confirms their authority. In the history of the Dæmoniac at Gadaris, Matt. viii. 28., where Mark only mentions one, Luke also has but one, viii. 27., Mark v. 2. Mark restricts the account of the two blind persons, on the road to Jericho, (Matt. xx. 30., Mark x. 46.,) to one: so also Luke xviii. 35. restricts it.

[r] The words of the ruler, when he first saw Jesus, were, according to Matthew, ἀρτι ἐτελευτησεν—according to Mark, ἐσχατως ἐχει—and according to Luke, ἀπεθνησκεν: Luke here, therefore, rather seems to agrees with Matthew, than with Mark. Some, however, have argued from Prov. v. 11. Σοφ. Σειρ. i. 13., and other examples, that the phrase in Mark is analogous to that in Matthew and Luke.—*Translator.*

SECTION XLIII.

He has also, indeed, here and there, illustrated a narrative by new circumstances, and detailed more largely the particulars, for instance, Matt. viii. 19—23. Luke ix. 57.—x. Matt. viii. 5—11. Luke vii. 2—9., and he has still more accurately corrected certain accounts of his predecessors. Matthew and Mark have stated the time, from the doctrinal discourse, which ends with the words, λεγω ὑμιν, εἰσι τινες των ὡδε ἑστηκοτων, οἱτινες οὐ μη γευσονται θανατου, Matt. xvi. 28., Mark ix. 1., to the Transfiguration, to have been six days; but Luke has stated it to have been eight days, ix. 27, 28.

Matthew relates, xxvii. 44., that the criminals, who were crucified with our Lord, reviled him: Mark allowed this to stand as he had found it in his predecessor, xv. 33. But Luke enters into a fresh inquiry, respecting the circumstances, and informs us that the one who had presumed to revile Jesus was reprimanded by the other for his conduct, xxiii. 32—43.; which is an observation, that Manes, the well-known heretic of the third century, made with a view of accusing the Evangelists of contradiction[s].

Matthew informs us only of one angel who addressed the women when they visited the tomb of Jesus, xxviii. 2. Mark follows him and mentions

[s] In Epiphanius. Hær. lxvi. n. 40. και γαρ εἰς των Εὐαγγελιστων λεγει, ὁτι οἱ λῃσται οἱ συνεσταυρωμενοι ἐβλασφημουν αὐτον· ὁ δε ἀλλος, οὐχι ὁτι μονον οὐκ ἐβλασφημουν οἱ ἀμφοτεροι, ἀλλα και ἀπολογιαν του ἑνος σημαινει. και γαρ ἐπετιμᾳ τῳ ἑτερῳ, και ἐλεγεν, ὁτι οὐ φοβῃ συ τον Θεον, ὁτι ἐν τῳ αὐτῳ κριματι ἐσμεν· οὑτος δε ἁγιος οὐδεν ἐποιησε. κ. τ. λ.

only one, xvi. 5. The account of Luke is different, according to which there were two, xxiv. 4., and John confirms the correctness of this declaration so distinctly, as even to point out the place in which each of the two was seen, xx. 12.

The combination, which to adjust these different accounts is deduced from a pretended common Hebrew or Syriac original text, from which they all translated, is a proof to us, that this hypothesis opens a wide field for the play of philological wit, but which, where we really stand in need of an explanation, offers little assistance. If in the original ܚܕ stood, we might read ܚܕ and ܚܕ; but from hence we can easily perceive, how one could translate ἀνηρ and another ἀνδρες, but not how Luke has exactly fixed upon δυο ἀνδρες. Not to mention, that in Matthew, if all verbs were written as participles, *in statu emphatico*, still there must be a principal verb, which, if the original be not in the whole intentionally indistinct, contains a singular or plural number of the noun, in some way decisive:—to say nothing of this, still the relative pronouns (ἰδεα αὐτου and ἐνδυμα αὐτου) must decide respecting the number.

It is clear, that Luke has herein corrected his predecessor, but he has not contradicted him. With regard to Matthew we have sufficiently explained ourselves, and we have shown from his design, that heedless of the minor circumstances, he combined into one argument facts summarily related, from which it appears, Jesus did what was written in the ancient books. So likewise is the contradiction with Mark visible, if we do not take into consideration his intention and the origin of his writing. For Mark wrote the discourses of Peter. He describes that which the Apostle stated in his explana-

tions of the Gospel of Matthew, and comprises it in one book, which appeared as an independent work.—But where this Apostle added nothing to a passage, or words, or to whole events, where he by chance, or from any other causes remarked nothing in the discourse, the passage remained as it was in Matthew; and Mark, who according to the ancients, solely adhered to the instruction of his teacher, and only published this, is neither guilty of infidelity in the narrative nor of a mistake. Luke indeed is more minute, but that is all, and even the morose disposition of the spiteful critic will never be enabled to charge Mark with untruth or contradiction to the others.

SECTION XLIV.

Facts which in all their circumstances were communicated by one of his predecessors he often but briefly mentioned, and epitomized like Mark. Of this description is the narrative in Luke ix. 46.; Matthew had already treated it diffusely enough, xviii. 1., and Mark made still an addition of several little circumstances which represented the occurrence more exactly and descriptively. Luke then might have found it unnecessary to dilate any farther on a fact which was exhausted and afforded to him no opportunity of saying any thing new. Therefore not merely to repeat what had been said, (for he would omit nothing) he simply gives to us a slight notice of it, which he concludes with the words of Mark, Luke ix. 48. Mark ix. 37. Luke ix. 7—9., cf Matt. xiv. 1. Mark vi. 14. Luke x. 25—29. Mark xii. 28—35.

Jesus warns his disciples to take heed against the leaven of the Pharisees, Matt. xvi. 5. Mark viii. 14. this was misunderstood until Jesus disclosed his meaning more distinctly. Now this matter occurs at large, in both Evangelists; but Luke only mentions it in a few words, and shows, that he considered it well known, that it belonged to this period in its chronological order, and instead of diffusely detailing the discussion, he adds its explanation in a single expression. This in fact is epitomized, for all, that he says upon it, is simply; *He began to say to his disciples: beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy,* Luke xii. 1.

SECTION XLV.

THE analysis which we have hitherto made of the three writings concerning the descent and ministry of our Lord enables us now to meet the hypothesis by which a distinguished scholar has attempted to illustrate the history of the origin of the Gospels, the leading position of which is as follows: MARK COMPILED HIS WRITINGS FROM THE COMMENTARIES OF MATTHEW AND LUKE[1], AND CONSEQUENTLY WROTE AFTER THEM.

The agreement (let us consider well the grounds adduced) between Matthew and Mark in the choice of the same events, from the ample historical stock which offered to the historians enough variety and

[1] The Whitsuntide Program of the University of Jena, 1789, by Professor Griesbach discusses the position: Marci Evangelium totum è Matthæi et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse.

matter for distinction, is certainly an acknowledged proof, that these two authors did not work independently of each other, which however affirms nothing as to the priority of the one or the other.

The fact, also, which has been adduced for the confirmation of the remaining assertion, with regard to Luke, namely, that he and Mark, in the detailed representation of events, for the most part agree and are distinct from Matthew, is very true and correct; but we might, with equal justice from hence conclude, that Luke had herein chosen Mark as his guide, as the contrary, which is thence inferred.

If Mark made Matthew and Luke the basis of his work, and if he intended to unite both in one treatise, he must have gone quite otherwise to work, or, on the other hand, no such a supposition may be deduced from his conduct, if, in other respects, the author's endeavours were agreeable to his views.

Luke is distinguished by a fullness and number of events which have remained totally untouched by Matthew. The great number of important and perfectly new facts which he has produced give to his work a superior and distinguished worth. If Mark had been acquainted with it, and if he had intended to produce a third work from it in conjunction with that of Matthew, he could not be so generally ignorant, and could not have so forborne to avail himself of that which is the most important in Luke, as, from the whole sum of his historical discoveries, only to have made use of two narratives, Sect. 29. We should rather have expected, that he would have extracted the most important parts from Luke and Matthew, and divided his choice between the two authors.

This however was not the case; but the facts in

Matthew are those alone on which his attention is fixed, and consequently the existing proofs support only the use of Matthew. Whatever aim we may suppose Mark to have had, with regard to his immediate readers, in the composition of his book, yet it must appear very extraordinary that among the numerous accounts and doctrinal discourses of Luke he should have met with almost nothing, which he deemed useful: and on the other hand, in Matthew, with almost every thing.

But if he chose the data from Matthew and the moulding of them according to their particular circumstances from Luke, as must have been the case, nothing which might be deemed his own, is left in Mark's whole book, and we must decide that he has afforded nothing as an author, but merely compiled that which every individual might have read in Matthew and Luke; that he has of his own accord undertaken and produced a superfluous work, destitute of an object.

Here I feel myself farther bound particularly to notice a more recent proposition, preferred by a scholar who has in other respects approached the nearest to my opinions. He accounts Luke the first of the Evangelists [u].

The principal reason which he assumes as a strong point in substantiation of his proposition is this: the apostolical authority was so great, that Luke, if Matthew had written before him, could not easily have presumed to compose another Gospel. Certainly:—the authority of an Apostle was great; thence comes even the respectful diffidence of Luke, and the modest apology in the pro-

[u] Vogel on the origin of the first three Gospels in Gabler's Journal for select Theol. Literat. 1 book, 1, c. p. 804.

logue with which he has opened his book. Cf. Section 34.

The second strong point this scholar finds in the remark, that Luke would have omitted none of the materials of Matthew, if he had been possessed of his writings. But he has omitted no part of them, except the history of Christ's infancy, for which he amply compensates us by other data. I—III. That part of the history which is wanting, which we have before noticed in Section 39., and which the Librarii have equally omitted in the first copies on account of the Homoioteleuton, cannot be imputed to the writer. He has again so carefully divided the single sentences of the sermon on the Mount, in his book, into eighteen or nineteen places, where they are all in a perfect connection, which is often so strikingly wanting to this discourse in Matthew, that we can no longer misunderstand the conjunction of the detached passages in Luke. Even those parts which Mark has omitted because they were not in their chronological order in Matthew, he has restored, cf. Section 28, 35, and 38. Throughout he does not merely comprise the materials of Matthew, but also those of Mark, in the latter of whom he has not even neglected the only three events, in which he is more copious than Matthew. Section 29.

Let us now at once reverse the matter; how much more copiousness has Luke than Matthew! not to be too circumstantially prolix, we will only notice the two remarkable journeys to Jerusalem, xi. 51., and xiii. 22., of which we have been informed by Luke alone, and even in these we will only notice the parables.

The first is the beautiful parable of the man, who on the road to Jericho, fell among thieves, x. 30. then that of him who wakes his friend by night, and

importunately asks him for bread. xi. 5. The parables of the lost sheep, of the woman who had lost a drachma, and of the prodigal son, xv. 1. xvi. the history of the rich man and Lazarus, of the widow who through importunity obained justice from the judge, xviii. 1. the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican praying, xviii. 10.,—are all splendid things exclusively belonging to Luke. Could he, even if all the Apostles had written before him, consign these to oblivion? did he not owe this supplement to the Christian school? On the contrary, why has Matthew, if he indeed wrote after Luke, not mentioned a word of all this? Why has he not once noticed it in his synoptical brevity, for the sake of imparting to these beautiful passages his testimony and corroboration, at least by means of a summary mention of them?

The answer is, that he would write nothing of which he had not himself been an eye-witness. Well; but the fourth part of his Sermon on the Mount is contained, according to the historical connexion, in these sections of Luke; he therefore either must have been present in this instance, or he could not have inserted in his book the doctrinal discourses delivered in these sections. Even in the third journey he passes over in silence the transaction with Zacchæus; and yet the apostle was present at the conversion of his former colleague: for the twelve accompanied our Lord. This answer therefore is not satisfactory.

Once more also: why did he not authenticate in his Gospel the historical copiousness of Luke, if the latter preceded him? Why did he not once authenticate in his Gospel so much excellent matter, even if it were only by a synoptical notice? Why did he not at all avail himself of the strict chronological succession of

facts which the other, according to the promise in his prologue, made his more particular care? Why did he not at all avail himself of that agreeable circumstantiality, by which Luke has enlivened the events, and disclosed also many emendations? Or, in a few words, why did he fall so far short of the perfection which the history had already attained?

SECTION XLVI.

We see from what I have opposed to these scholars that the order of the Evangelists is not, arbitrarily, adopted, but that it is given to us according to the plan and conduct, which we observe in each of them.

The succession of historical writers, who laboured one after the other, and did not leave themselves unknown, if their agreement could not be inferred from any declaration of the history, may be discovered in two different ways. Either one exhibits merely additions and supplements to a history, from which we may then conclude, what and how much he pre-supposes already known, and what historical books his conduct shows to be antecedent to him; or else these historical authors do not merely content themselves with supplements, but repeat the old matter, and add their own in its proper place.

Three of the Evangelists have said the same things, consequently two of them have repeated the old matter. Whose work then, among the three, has mostly the appearance of a first design? Which, considered altogether, as to materials, and the mode of using them, contains the criteria of the incipient history? which of them has carelessly arranged

the facts? frequently placed together the materials, merely, according to their similarity, and less attentively examined the individual circumstances of the occurrences, and their more precise objects? But, which has the more carefully placed the events in their order of time? and the more accurately arranged them according to their succession? which has more attentively collected the individual circumstances, described the facts more definitively and accurately, and imparted to them more fulness and energy?

Lastly, which is by far the more exact in the position of events, according to their time? which is by far the more explicit in individual details? richer in his collection of facts? more comprehensive and more complete in materials and the manner of using them?

This gradation in the improvement of the same history, very soon enables us to perceive the first and last author; it soon discovers to us the order, in which they follow each other; and indeed in this case that very order, with which the history made us acquainted from the beginning, and which antiquity has unanimously maintained, from the guidance of which we have taken our standing point in the investigation, uncertain whether it would be confirmed, as the true and correct one, in the issue.

If we consider the Gospels in this progress all those difficulties will easily be resolved, which have led others to different views. It is evident from it, how Mark could have seen Matthew, and have nevertheless arranged several occurrences differently, placed several in a peculiar light by means of the singularity of the circumstances, and so have applied some assertions, that they even appear to contradict Matthew. Or how Luke could have seen Mark and yet

could frequently be more correct in the series,—in the detail of time, place and circumstances; and how, notwithstanding his copiousness, he has also been more concise in some cases than he might possibly have been, had he not had respect to the full account of his predecessor.

All these and the like scruples which are said to be the supports of the recently produced hypothesis, cease of themselves, as soon as we put them to the test of this theory, the principles of which are authenticated by the history, and confirmed by the critical analysis of the writings under examination.

SECTION XLVII.

Luke, therefore, found the works of Matthew and Mark, and several other writings which treated of the life, ministry, and actions of our Lord, already published; what then he has performed we will here comprise in one view.

In the discourses of Jesus he has closely adhered to Matthew and to his words, which seldom is the case in the narratives. Mark has done just the same, where he makes mention of the discourses of our Lord. We could not consider the cause of this before, nor could we longer postpone the question relative to it. It may here precede as an introduction to the promised survey.

Matthew was induced to compose his Gospel by the situation and necessity of an age, in which the fortunes of the Jewish state hastened towards their conclusion. The interval from the days of Jesus to that period is too great for a man's memory to detail faithfully all that, which he who is the object of the history, had done and said. Actions are indeed less

liable to escape from the mind, especially if one was an eye-witness of them, or if one had received them from a lively representation of the eye-witnesses; but it is more dangerous to trust to the recollection alone, for sentiments and doctrines, according to the very word and expression.

The more easy part Matthew might well have resigned to his memory, the more so, as the idea of writing our Lord's history a long time afterwards first suggested itself to him. But his master's sublime doctrines and words of wisdom laid a stronger claim upon his mind, and must always have been present to himself and ministry. For the performance of this his official practice of noting things afforded him an impulse and adroitness which others did not possess; and, thus, it happened that his previous notes became the foundation of the Gospel the traces of which we perceive in itself. In apophthegms, dogmata, and parables, Matthew is rich, even to profusion. Often they are merely arranged according to their similarity; allegories, moral maxims, and exhortations, solely brought together according to the approximation of their contents, still display the visible tokens of a collection from which they are extracted. As he stood in need of no one's assistance in his previous annotations, his book was considered by his successors as a document and source in the discourses of Jesus.

On the other hand, the facts, in him, have more the appearance of accidents. He indeed detailed them, invested with circumstances, but oftener only in the outline, according as his recollection presented them to him: with which he might have been satisfied, as his object required no more. To perfect these, to arrange them chronologically, and to distribute the doctrines in the situation to which they

belonged, was the object of Mark's endeavours, as far as his Voucher pointed them out to him.

In the mean time the fate of Palestine was decided. Chritianity ceased henceforward to exist in the Jewish civil community; it was freed from the propensities to Judaism, and declared itself independent of its ordinances. The half-Jews became irritated by it, separated themselves, and composed, as it seems, their Gospels, that of the Nazorœans, and that of the Ebionites. Others gathered up, on the historical soil, even the fragments of preceding traditions, and thus the writings "*of many*" appeared.

This might have been nearly the state of things when Luke felt himself induced to preserve the field of history pure from unauthenticated accounts. Matthew was his manual in the speeches of our Lord, to which he verbally adhered, although he inserted them in the history, dispersed behind, before, or in the middle, singly or in greater portions, and so felicitously united them, that their connection with the facts and their occasion are admirably seen from themselves. But of the facts he has only taken those directly from Matthew which Mark omitted; he has, however, assigned to them a totally different arrangement as to time.

He has chosen Mark as his guide in two different respects: in the succession of the facts where he has arranged them differently from Matthew, and in the modelling of the facts acccording to their circumstances. Yet he did not exclusively confine himself to him; where he could illustrate or enlarge a narrative by new circumstances, Luke did not spare the trouble. Individual circumstances which admitted an emendation and were allowed to remain in Mark, because they were so in Matthew, received from him a more determinate character. But where,

on the contrary, nothing remained to be added, investigated, or represented more correctly, he contented himself with merely a brief notice, on the supposition of their known development elsewhere.

Such facts as were new and not adduced he inserted in the connection, which they required as to place and time. He alone has informed us of the following more important parts of the history; the history of the infancy of Jesus mixed with pieces of beautiful poetical and religious inspiration: two remarkable journeys to Jerusalem which comprise many sublime lessons, parables, and striking delineations: also the history of the disciples from the resurrection of Jesus until the ascension. Probably much has been lost with the part of the history that has disappeared between the feeding of the five thousand and that of the four thousand, with which he had enlarged or more nearly determined the preceding works of his fellow-labourers. But however it may be, the increase of the history by his means, the progress which it has made through him in great and small matters, are so evidently and so indubitably manifest to every one, that we have no occasion to take into consideration that which it has lost for the sake of acknowledging and revering it.

How much of the accounts of "*the many*" he has admitted into his work with or without improvement we could only ascertain, by being still possessed of their accounts. As little can it any longer be defined, how far he has been upon the whole as an individual, an eye-witness. As being present in the country of the history, at the time, when the events began to attract notice, he was in a situation of seeing very much himself, and of devoting to the whole that attention which was due to it, of scrutinizing the assertions of the public voice as well as the in-

sinuations of the antagonists, of separating the true from the unauthenticated, of forming a judgment in the midst of the fermentation of opinions, and of obtaining a certain insight into them. As a man of information and polished education, who had directed his mind to these events, he was more induced than others to undertake a written work, which, as circumstances seemed to require it, afforded to him spirit and confidence, to render superfluous and supersede spurious writings by means of a true historical book.

JOHN.

SECTION XLVIII.

Last of all also, the disciple, who laid in the bosom of our Lord, has also delivered to his cotemporaries a memorial of his master, of the origin and intention of which some declarations of the ancients are extant, but they are too much disputed to be raised to the rank of established principles, by which its object may be explained. It is, therefore, requisite that we should enter into the structure and arrangement of the book, for the sake of thence supplying the want of undisputed records.

This Evangelist proceeds according to his own views, and is so far similar to Matthew, in completely pursuing the proofs of some few positions in the progress of the history of Jesus and collecting facts and discourses relative to them: but he differs from him in not losing sight of the thread in the course of things and their natural succession,

and in imposing on himself in a very complicated and ingenious plan, not the order of the materials but that of the history.

After a somewhat obscure introduction with which he opens the book, the first fact which he relates to us contains the acknowledgment of *Jesus* as *Christ* or *Messiah*, by the Baptist, i. 19—34., and then, by Peter and Andrew, i. 41—44. After this follows the attestation of Philip, that Jesus is he of whom Moses and the Prophets wrote, and that of Nathaniel, who accounted him the *Son of God* and the *King of Israel.* i. 44. ii.

When, after the first miracle at Cana, Jesus appeared in Jerusalem, he declared the temple to be THE HOUSE OF HIS FATHER, ii. 16., and to Nicodemus he declared himself AS GOD'S ONLY-BEGOTTEN SON, whom out of love THE FATHER had sent into the world for its salvation, iii. ii. 2—22. After the return from Jerusalem the Baptist again certifies, that JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD SENT FROM ABOVE IN WHOSE HANDS ALL POWER IS DEPOSITED. iii. 23.—iv. He is now about to return home through Samaria; a woman of this country perceives something extraordinary in him, and our Lord confesses to her that he is the MESSIAH, or the CHRIST. iv. 25., and many others believed that he was THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD and THE CHRIST, iv. 42.

When he was the second time in Jerusalem he healed the man who had been waiting in vain at the bath of Bethesda. When the Jews reviled him for the miracle on account of the violation of the Sabbath, he asserted that his power was the power of God delegated to him, that GOD WAS HIS FATHER, that HE WAS HIS SON, THE APPOINTED GOVERNOR AND JUDGE OF THE WORLD; of whom

Moses wrote, v. vi. After his return he effected a miracle on the loaves, so that the people deemed him the PROMISED PROPHET, and wished to make him KING of ISRAEL, vi. 14, 15. On the following day he declared himself, THE BREAD OF LIFE WHICH COMES FROM HEAVEN, as *having been* with the FATHER, and *having come from* the FATHER, and Simon acknowledged to him: "THOU ART THE HOLY ONE OF GOD;" vi. 69.

At the time of the Feast of the Tabernacles he again visits Jerusalem, and publicly censures those who seek his life; on which some asserted that HE WAS THE CHRIST; and that the Christ himself could not perform more signs than he, vii. 11—37. On the last day of the feast he is again considered as THE PROPHET and THE CHRIST, on which subject, learned discussions arose, vii. 37—viii.

If we continue thus to consider all the actions of Jesus which John has admitted into his book, all the speeches and discourses according to their order, we shall almost throughout find this to be their principal subject, viz. that JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD, that JESUS IS THE CHRIST, or both positions together, viii. 12—ix. ix. 1—35. and 38. x. 1—24. x. 24—xi. xi. 1—27. xii. 13—20. xii. 20—34. xii. 44, 45, 49. The chapters from xiv. to xviii. express in their consolations and promises the relation between Father and Son, the heavenly origin of Jesus, his dignity as Messiah, Ruler, and Judge of the World.

Like Matthew he has also so treated the history of his Passion, that from a comparison of the prophecies, the character of Jesus, as the Messiah, is evident, xix. 24. 28. 36, 37.

The whole plan of the book, and the well-digested

selection in all its separate parts *, lead us therefore to the same explanation of the author's ultimate object, as he has most clearly pointed out to us, at the onset, namely, it was to prove, that JESUS IS THE SON OF GOD, and that JESUS IS THE CHRIST, XX. 31.

SECTION XLIX.

A DOGMATICAL treatise of this extent on so few positions, must have been, from the circumstances of the time, indispensably necessary, and we might suppose, that this copious detail, and these accumulated proofs had a polemical object, which occupied the sacred Theologian.

But on this head the first epistle of John, which, as we shall afterwards see, was written with the same view, at the same time, and for the same destination as the Gospel, places us beyond doubt. At that time certain persons had proceeded from Christianity, upright professors of which they probably never were, 1 John ii. 19., who confounded the doctrines of Christianity, ii. 18., raised false theories, ψευστας, were false teachers and impostors, ii. 22. iv. 1, 2, 3., and denied that Jesus was THE SON OF GOD and THE CHRIST, ii. 22. iv. 1, 2, 3. 15, 16. v. 5. 20. These excited in the heart of the Apostle that anxiety and those exertions to maintain pure doctrines and the repose of the Christian churches.

* The same observation has been made by Prof. Paulus, and well detailed in Commentat. Theolog. Historiam Cerinthi ad finem Johanneorum in N. T. libellorum illustraturæ, Jenæ. 1795. 8vo. p. 157. sq.

SECTION L.

But those are not thus brought nearer before us, with whom John contends in his Gospel. According to ancient history they were several, who, in the lifetime of the disciple, even in those churches to which he had directed his more particular attention, and in whose bosom he had resolved to dwell, set up in different systems, the position, that Jesus is not Christ and the Son of God.

All, however variously they might be distinguished in other points, were dangerous in this respect. The error, was the same, under many forms, and the Apostle, when he was writing, certainly had in his mind all those who were guilty of this heresy, without excepting the one or the other by any complaisant distinction. Consequently we need not ask; Was this book directed against Cerinthus? when it is proved that the man lived in those days, resided in these parts, asserted this dogma, and moreover was reputed as a teacher, as is the case with him.—It was directed against all those, who endeavoured to mislead the Christians, to whom John wrote, by this dogma, amidst whatever modifications and theories it might be.

It cannot be denied, that according to the certain depositions of history, Cerinthus was a cotemporary of the Apostle, that he resided in those parts where John superintended the instruction and duties of the Gospel, and that this error was part of his doctrinal system. Next to him the Nicolaitans appeared, who caused much corruption in these Churches, and required all the vigilance of the Apostle. They

agreed with Cerinthus, in this position, as well as in many other points.

If we were even destitute of historical assertions upon this point, if Irenæus, Jerome, and Epiphanius[y] had not expressly mentioned Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans as false teachers whose seductions John was desirous of opposing, yet the authentic declaration which he has inserted in his first epistle respecting false teachers, and the plan and contents of his book compared with them as well as with the histories of the time in general, must conduct us to these persons, just as certainly, as decidedly historical securities.

From the aggregate of Cerinthus's opinions, according to the philosophy of those days, the following doctrinal system results. There is one Deity elevated above all; this is the highest unity, and could not therefore be operative on matter and be the Creator of the world. From this emanated most pure and perfect natures, *invisibilia et innominabilia*, which again propagated themselves, and from gradation to gradation downwards increased in materiality, and decreased in spirituality, so that they continued to stand only in an inferior immediate connection with THE ONLY AND ETERNAL ONE; but on account of the increasing grossness of the substance they could only work upon matter like sculptors.

One substance of the latter order was the Creator of the world, who did not at all know THE PURE and

[y] Iren. adv. Hær. L. iii. c. 9. Hanc fidem annuntians Domini Discipulus volens per Evangelii annuntiationem auferre eum, qui a Cerintho inseminatus est hominibus errorem, et multo prius ab his, qui dicuntur Nicolaitæ . . . . . sic inchoavit . . . . . In principio etc. Hieronym. Script. Eccl. V. Johannis. Epiphan. Hær. lxix.

ETERNAL SPIRIT [a]; thence, however, arose the imperfection also of the creation and evil—a problem, the solution of which, has given rise to the most contrary theories in which the philosophers of these and of former times have distinguished themselves.

As a philosopher he found a difficulty in admitting that Jesus was born of a virgin, and maintained that Jesus was begotten and born in conformity with the laws of nature like the rest of mankind; but that as a man, he was likewise exalted above all in wisdom and nobleness of soul.

But, on the other hand, for the sake of acknowledging in Jesus something of a higher origin, which his actions so plainly proved, he pretended that one of these spiritual natures, namely the Christ, had at the baptism united itself with him in the shape of a dove:—that he had therefore, from this time, performed supernatural deeds and operations of higher powers, and that hereupon he likewise acquainted men with the true and eternal God, who hitherto had remained unknown to them, not having revealed himself by means of any creation or work.

This Christ, as an immaterial substance of a more exalted origin *è superioribus Christus*, was, as a spirit of a purer sort, as to his essence, not susceptible of material affections, of sufferings and pains, he therefore separated himself again from Jesus at the commencement of his sufferings, abandoned him to

[a] Iren. L. iii. c. 2. Eam conditionem quæ est secundum nos, non a primo Deo factam, sed a Virtute aliquâ valde deorsum subjectâ, et abscissâ ab eorum communicatione, quæ sunt invisibilia et innominabilia. L. i. c. 26. à virtute quâdam valde separatâ .... et ignorante eum, qui est super omnia, Deum.

his torments and death, and arose on high to THE ETERNAL, from whom he had proceeded. Cerinthus distinguishes Jesus and Christ, Jesus and the Son of God, as Beings of a different nature and eminence from each other [a].

The Nicolaitans had a similar doctrine of the supreme God, and his relations to the world, and of an inferior spirit who is the Creator of the world. Among the subaltern class of spirits they principally reckoned the only-begotten μονογενης, whose existence, however, had a beginning, and then the λογος, who is an immediate descendant of this only-begotten. Whatever other ideas they might have had of them, history does not mention.

The Christ belongs to the order of beings who proceeded from God; but Jesus is a Son of the Creator of the world, to whom the Christ united himself at the baptism, deserting him in his sufferings [b].

[a] The older reading, 1 John iv. 3.very wellexhibits this distinction, to which a historian Socrat. H. E. L. vii. c. 32., calls our attention. He testifies that it was formerly read εν τοις παλαιοις αντιγραφοις:— παν πνευμα ὁ λυει τον Ιησουν (add in idea, απο του Χριστου) εκ Θεου ουκ εστι. This reading, he continues, the ancient expositors, οἱ παλαιοι ἑρμηνεις, have also acknowledged as the true one. We find it still in Irenæus, L. iii. c. 16. n. 8. et omnis spiritus, qui solvit Jesum, non est ex Deo, in Tertullian and in several authors, who follow the older Latin translation, but we possess no longer any Greek copies of the Catholic epistles, which represent the text of that early epoch. Nevertheless internal grounds justify this reading; it is the more obscure and the more difficult, which pre-supposes learning and knowledge: but the present reading; παν πνευμα, ὁ μη ὁμολογει τον Ιησουν, εκ Θεου ουκ εστι, has the suspicion of conformity with the preceding clause against it.

[b] According to some traces, but which are not pointed out with sufficient perspicuity, for us to regard them as fully decisive, we might likewise include such teachers, as denied that Christ had a material body and only admitted the appearance of one, and the appearance of sufferings, viz. the Doketæ, who denied Ιησουν

SECTION LI.

The Evangelist, in the beginning of his book, emphatically dwells upon the assertion; "Jesus is the light and the life," i. 4. 5. 9., and on these two positions his eye is fixed in the course of the narrative, and collected into the form of a plan, according to his custom. iii. 19—22. v. 34. 35. viii. 12. ix. 5. xii. 35. 36. and 46. Afterwards vi. 35. and 48. vi. 51—60. x. 28. ix. 25, 26. xiv. 6. xvii. 3.

It appears from his admission of the facts into a plan, that the sacred writer had also such men before him, as denied that Jesus was the light and the life;—or, not to speak figuratively, that he was the moral restorer and instructor of the world, to whom the merit belonged of having conducted them from their errors to a blessed knowledge. There are several ends which he wished to attain:—that Jesus is the Christ—that he is the Son of God—and that

Χριστον ἐν σαρκι ἐληλυθοτα, 1 Epist. iv. 2. 2 Epist. 7. Here also we might reckon the passage in the Gospel xix. 34—38., in which John protests, that blood and water had really flowed from the side. But these passages are also capable of a different interpretation; Ἰησουν Χριστον ἐν σαρκι ἐληλυθοτα, or, ἐρχομενον, we may also understand, that Jesus had not only united himself at the Baptism with Christ but that he had entered into the world as Christ, and was born as such, Cf. Storr, on the object of the Evangelical history of John and of the Epistles, Sect. 21. There exists however, no necessity, nor even probability in this: had he intended to attack this Sect, he would not have mentioned it in two places so slightly, and even dubiously. The article of Faith which the Gospel and the first Epistle so strongly presses, is, that Jesus is the Christ and the Son of God. This the Doketæ were so far from denying, that they even maintained that *the true and the real*, which *the apparent* contained or concealed, was the Christ and the Son of God.

THOSE who believe in him obtain life by becoming his disciples, xx. 31. ὁτι ὁ Ἰησους ἐστιν ὁ Χριστος, ὁ υἱος του Θεου, και ἱνα πιστευοντες ζωην ἐχητε ἐν τῳ ὀνοματι αὐτου.

It is also not difficult to conjecture who was the person, whom some regarded in preference to our Lord as the enlightener of the world, and the author of the doctrine of the life.—*It* was John the Baptist. Where the author, immediately at the beginning of his book, proclaims to us the doctrine. THE LOGOS IS THE LIGHT, WHICH SHONE [c] IN THE DARKNESS, he adds, but John was come TO BEAR WITNESS OF THE LIGHT. This is plain, and requires nothing further. But the author has here a more deeply rooted apprehension, and forcibly repeats this assertion, for the second time, in an antithesis, and at last repeats again the first member of it, to corroborate it, for the third time. "HE CAME FOR A WITNESS, NAMELY TO BEAR WITNESS TO THE LIGHT, THAT THROUGH HIM ALL MEN MIGHT BELIEVE; YET, HE WAS NOT HIMSELF THAT LIGHT, BUT HIS OFFICE WAS ONLY TO BEAR WITNESS TO THE LIGHT. THE TRUE LIGHT WAS HE WHO CAME INTO THE WORLD TO ENLIGHTEN ALL MANKIND[d]." Gospel i. 7, 8.

The Evangelist has also, in his selection, considered those discourses of Jesus, in which he de-

[c] The Rabbinical writers had reveries respecting אור, not very dissimilar to those, which form the subject of St. John's allusions. In speaking of it, they also mention it, as shining in the darkness, מעירה באפילה. Hug well expresses the sense by STRAHLEN, *to emit or dart rays*, in which he appears to have followed the Arabic Translator. و لنور اضاء في الظلمة *Translator.*

[d] In these extracts, a translation of Hug's text has been preferred to an exact conformity with our authorized version, as in many instances, he has rather paraphrazed than quoted the passages.—*Translator.*

scribed himself higher than John, or the confessions of the Baptist, in which * he describes the præ-existence of Jesus, his unattainable dignity, as a Teacher, Saviour, and the author of life, and his own inferiority to him, as a disciple and messenger. i. 15. i. 20—30. iii. 26—36. v. 34—37. x. 41.

We also find in this country, and in this city, (viz. Ephesus,) which the Evangelist had chosen for his residence, men in the days of Nero, who only were acquainted with the baptism of John, who were his disciples initiated in it, and who had heard nothing of the Spirit, on whom Paul afterwards laid his hands and communicated to them baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus and the Holy Ghost, so that they spake in tongues, Acts. xix. 1—8. They were certainly not the only persons of their age; but many might have been more strenuous in their predilection for their teacher and less flexible in their convictions.

To such, those passages seem to have been directed, and to have been collected for them, in which John ventures not to compare his baptism — the baptism of water — with the baptism of water and the Spirit, i. 33. iii. 26. 30. as well as the parenthesis relative to the gifts of the Spirit, vii. 39., (which rather contains an illustration for strangers than for the believers, and the high recommendation of regeneration by water and the Spirit,

* The Codex Nazaræus has preserved a considerable number of these notions: it also contains undeniable extracts from the Gospels, which are admixed with these dogmata. In these we discover a constant antithesis between ⲛⲟⲩⲧ or LIGHT, and ⲕⲁⲕⲉ or DARKNESS, which are figuratively applied to the principles of good and evil. From this book, we may learn the opinions of this sect to a considerable degree.—*Translator.*

iii. 3—12.,) and all the speeches of Jesus respecting the Comforter and the Spirit, which after his glorification should be poured out on his faithful followers. xiv. 16, 17. xiv. 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7—15.

SECTION LII.

The conduct of the Evangelist in the execution of his plan is remarkably singular, and a problem to the solution of which we are compelled. According to what we see, very great reflection and a deeply-meditated outline predominate in the arrangement of the book, in the selection of events for a particular purpose, even to the individual parts and minutiæ; nevertheless John has not at all noticed the most valid proofs in favour of the chief position of his treatise, (not, because from an unfavourable union of circumstances, they might fail him on a nearer insight into them) but he has noticed those convincing events, with which he was intimately acquainted on account of his personal presence and participation in them, and which on account of the traces inherent in them of that which is great, superhuman and astonishing, could never be obliterated from any one's recollection.

Could he omit such important facts, if they had not already been detailed by other authentic authors? Could he have even abandoned with indifference the best proofs for his purpose, and have excluded the most convincing arguments from his plan, if other historians had not already preceded him in them?

In the Synagogue at Capernaum there was a Dæmoniac, who knew Jesus and exclaimed to him:

THOU ART THE HOLY ONE OF GOD, etc. John was present, for when Jesus leaves the synagogue, he is in his company with James and Andrew, Mark i. 29., and this miracle is one of the first, which he saw his master perform.

At Gadaris a legion of Dæmons recognizes Jesus as THE SON OF THE MOST HIGH GOD. Matt. viii. 29. Mark v. 7. Luke viii. 28. John was present, for on the return we find him in the company of our Lord. Mark v. 37. Luke viii. 51.

Among the several testimonies which he adduces in support of the dignity of Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God, this sort also deserves a consideration. The testimony of the spiritual world was to many, in consequence of their opinions, a more important proof than any other, and a security so much the less to be rejected, because they were even hostile powers, who could not withhold this dignity from our Lord.

He passes over in entire silence what happened to Jesus before Caiaphas, and occupies himself solely with the adventures of Peter in the hall of this Priest. Yet he is the Evangelist, who discloses a clear knowledge of all the minor circumstances, in the whole history of the passion, and therein excels all the other Gospels, by being well acquainted with these proceedings also, and mentions them with more precision than the others,— by showing that Jesus was not brought immediately to Caiaphas, but first to Annas, by stating the reason of this, and then contrasting much more minutely, what Peter did on both occasions. Thus, he pursued, with his historical discernment, a secondary affair, leaving that in suspense, which forcibly conducted him to his chief object. For, before Caiaphas, Jesus was examined, his declarations were taken down, the wit-

nesses investigated, and, in fact, the process drawn up which should have been brought before the Prætor, and here, that which was the most important point for his views, was put down: viz. the judicial declaration of Jesus attesting the Living and Most High God, that he was the Son of God and the Messiah, THAT HE HENCEFORWARD SHOULD TAKE HIS PLACE ON THE RIGHT HAND OF THE POWER OF GOD AND BE BORNE ON THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN. Matt. xxvi. 64. Mark xiv. 62. Luke xxii. 69.

But the transfiguration on the Mount which John had witnessed was evidently the highest proof of the assertions of his work, and infinitely elevated above all adduced confessions of pious men, of the disciples of Jesus, and the convictions of all other Jews and Heathens. Besides the Baptism, Jesus was only once more, here, *acknowledged by* THE GODHEAD HIMSELF IN A HEAVENLY VOICE AS HIS BELOVED SON, IN WHOM HE WAS WELL PLEASED. Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 27. Hence, also, the appointment of the Baptist, his reference to Jesus, and his rank and calling subordinate to those of Jesus, which is one of the subjects to be illustrated in John's Gospel were defined and considered. Matt. xvii. 10. Mark ix. 12. To all this, however, John has not devoted a single word.

Also even the only circumstance which could afford a proof as powerful as these to substantiate his object, viz. the history of the baptism of Jesus, he leaves untouched and undiscussed, and only introduces to us the Baptist speaking, who indeed says something which has reference to it, but which alone, if the history of the baptism had not been known from other sources, would neither be understood by us or by others. "JOHN BARE RECORD, AND SAID," (thus he introduces him speaking, i. 32, 33, 34,)

"I SAW THE SPIRIT DESCENDING LIKE A DOVE, FROM HEAVEN, AND RESTING ON HIM. I KNEW HIM NOT, BUT HE, WHO SENT ME TO BAPTIZE WITH WATER, THE SAME SAID UNTO ME; HE UPON WHOM THOU SHALT SEE THE SPIRIT DESCENDING AND RESTING, IS HE WHO SHALL BAPTIZE WITH THE HOLY GHOST. THIS I SAW, AND BARE RECORD, THAT HE IS THE SON OF GOD." From this we do not even learn when and how the Spirit rested upon him, and only obtain an assertion of the Baptist that he was an eye-witness of this phænomenon and thence regarded Jesus as the Son of God. But that this took place at the administration of the baptism, that when Jesus came out of the water, the Spirit descended upon him, that the heavens were opened, and that the voice proceeded from thence, "THIS IS MY BELOVED SON IN WHOM I AM WELL PLEASED," we do not find in our Evangelist; and we should not even be so fortunate as to understand him, to conceive what the speech of the Baptist means, and at what it aims, if we had not obtained from other sources the insight, which the Evangelist presupposes.

It then requires no erudition to perceive, that John has produced no proof in his whole book in support of his design, which bears the most distant comparison as to solidity and authority, with those, which he has laid aside. Can it be supposed that he probably omitted to mention and notice these convincing facts, which from circumstances he knew better than any of the Evangelists, in the hope, that in time historians would arise, who would record them and enforce them with his best arguments? or could he, and might he only omit them, because others had already appropriated these materials to his purpose, so that he could no longer make use of them without doing already

what had been done? If we find the first contrary to reason, the second will certainly be the true explanation. Consequently such matter alone remained to the Apostle, aiding and conducing to his purposes, as preceding authors had left to him unappropriated: which was the extent of his whole task, although it had by no means an equal importance with that, of which use had already been made. He therefore was compelled to act as he has done in the execution of his department.

His conduct with regard to two principal subjects, morality and miracles, is only to be explained by this supposition. For the sake of exhibiting Jesus, to the better educated Asiatics, in a point of view, from which they would be qualified to appreciate him more than others, it has been imagined, that John would have chosen for his subject Christ's wisdom which ennobles morality, that he would have undertaken to show, that the world had witnessed nothing like it. But he finds himself more impelled by other claims: viz. to corroborate the divine obligation and the divine truth of this and all other doctrines; and to prove, that Jesus, who had proclaimed these doctrines, was not a man merely instructed by a higher Being:—that this Jesus possesses the highest legislative power: that he had existed with God before the foundation of the world, προ καταβολης κοσμου;——that he was united with God—the partner of his wisdom and power—the Son of God,—or, which is the same thing, the Messiah, ὁ Χριστος:—that he came immediately from heaven—and that he returned to the possession of his hereditary glory, after having completed the office of reforming the world. To demonstrate this, he appeals to the assertions of Jesus himself, which he communicates copiously and

explicitly. He acts thus, being fully conscious, that attention had been paid to the moral doctrine by others; he, therefore, rather intended to bring to light the immediate divine origin, and the great holiness of this and all the other doctrines collectively.

But by what means has he established the credibility of the assertions of Jesus? By Miracles. In the whole book, where our Lord declares his divine descent, his dignity as the only begotten Son of the Most High, he attests the truth of his declarations, by the miracles which he performed. Men, who accredit and vindicate his assertions, defend them by signs and works of Divine power; σημεια, ii. 23., iii. 2., iv. 48. σημεια και τερατα, v. 19—21., v. 36., vi. 2. 14. 26., vii. 3. 31., ix. 3, 4. ἐργα του Θεου, ix. 16. σημεια, ix. 31—34., x. 21. 25. 37, 38. 41. xi. 42. 45., xi. 47. πολλα σημεια, xii. 18., xii. 37—43., xiv. 10—13., xv. 24. The proof, therefore, rests entirely on miracles [f], yet John mentions but few: —he narrates only the histories of five Miracles. How could he do this, if he was not sure that this part of the events was previously attested by well-known memoirs, and that the proof, on which all depended in the last instance, was already adduced?

[f] We may hence judge, whether John has omitted the miracles, merely becouse they did not belong to his conceptions of the Messiah, and were but little according to Hellenic taste. It were, then, inconceivable that in the last instance, he should have retraced every thing to miracles. It is therefore, the antient Messiah, and Son of God, attested by means of miracles (not a Hellenistic Messiah, less gross than the one of Palestine, in a merely metaphysical view,) whom he mentions in his Gospel, for the purpose of assisting the speculations of the inhabitants of Asia Minor,—proceeding from which idea some have expected to establish the object and design of the Gospel. His endeavours are rather bent on setting limits to the unwieldy speculation of the Asiatics.

He likewise, in the narrative of the Lord's Supper, clearly assumes the existence of other authentic historical narratives. This fact, as it contained the precept for the future festival in memory of our Lord, throughout Christendom, was an inalienable object to be preserved in written documents, and who was better qualified to write an account of it, than the disciple, who there rested upon the bosom of our Lord? But in his book, he says just so much about it, as to show, that he intentionally omits the narrative, as it did not stand in need of being recalled to mind; therefore he proceeds to accessory events which are found no where else, but in him. "BEFORE THE PASSOVER," (so he speaks of it,) "JESUS WAS AWARE, THAT THE HOUR OF HIS DEPARTURE APPROACHED; BUT HE STILL LOVED HIS OWN, HE LOVED THEM EVEN TO THE END. WHEN THE SUPPER WAS ENDED, *και δειπνου γενομενου*, HE AROSE AND GIRDED HIMSELF, AND POURED WATER INTO THE BASIN," etc. "AFTER HE HAD WASHED THEIR FEET, HE AGAIN WENT TO THE TABLE, *παλιν ἀναπεσων*;" there is no where as yet a word of the consecration of the bread and the cup; only of the treachery of Judas, xiii. 1—23. Is it possible to pass over more intentionally such a pathetic and important event? Is it possible more explicitly to præ-suppose it attested and secured against oblivion or against the changes of time and accident?

All this then, the historical existence of which, his mode of procedure and his plan already assume, and require to have preceded and to have been written before his own relation, all this is in our Gospels, from them only can we develop the singularity of his proceeding, and from them only can we perceive what his mind already conceived to have been

extant and recorded;—these were the Gospels which lay before him.

Certain retrospects which he has made to the earlier existing narratives of his predecessors, and which are of a very individual nature, concur very strikingly with our Evangelists. After, according to John's Gospel, Jesus had chosen his first disciples, and commenced his miracles at Cana, he went from Nazareth to Capernaum, where he intended to reside. Soon after, a Passover took place, to keep which, our Lord, for the first time in his new vocation, travelled to Jerusalem, ii. 13. Now, as he after the festival travelled homewards from this city through Judæa, he baptized, and John, for the same purpose, sojourned in Ænon, near Salim, where he had a great concourse of candidates for baptizm, and Disciples, iii. 22. Now in relating the actions of the Baptist, he adds, "FOR ON NO ACCOUNT WAS JOHN ALREADY CAST INTO PRISON; οὐπω γαρ ἠν βεβλημενος εἰς την φυλακην."

This addition is no explanation of his own narrative, for, that he was free, its whole contents indeed shew. It is, consequently, a correction of other accounts, inserted for the purpose of rendering them definite.

This really occurs in two of our Gospels. Matthew, with whom chronology was out of the question, says, immediately after the temptation, before Jesus had gone to Capernaum, that John was imprisoned, iv. 12. Mark adhered to the words, i. 4., as his Voucher had altered nothing in them. Luke only avoided the anachronous arrangement of this account, iv. 14. To whom then is the observation now to be referred? "HE WAS IN NO WISE ALREADY CAST INTO PRISON?"

Respecting the sinful woman, who anointed Jesus,

his conduct again in this respect is remarkable. He speaks xi. 1. of Bethany the dwelling-place of MARY and MARTHA whose brother lay ill. At this he breaks off from the historical narrative and at the word MARY recollects in a parenthesis that, THIS WAS THE MARY, (so he adds) WHO ANOINTED THE LORD WITH MYRRH, AND DRIED HIS FEET WITH HER HAIR.

He himself has not yet told this history of the person who anointed him, but for the first time introduces it in the sequel, where he gives a more intimate description of the person herself, xii. 1. According to this mode of relation, he assumes this fact as generally known, before he himself gives an account of it, but judges it necessary to inform the reader of the name of the person, which he thought was unknown to him.

Our Gospels have related the history, and the supposition of it being already known seems to indicate an earlier existence of our Gospels; but none of them has made us acquainted with the person by her name or by the other circumstances, so that this observation is quite pertinent to their relation, and the intention of it is obvious in them.

But this is not sufficient; the traces of the three former are still more distinctly pointed out. Mark has added something to the relation of this event, as it is in Matthew, yet in such a manner, that the identity of the fact continues to be perfectly recognizable: but Luke has passed over these circumstances in the two preceding, and enumerated others united with them, from whence we might be misled to consider this fact as a second of an entirely distinct nature; and the more so, as Luke has likewise referred it to another period. Matthew and Mark state, that she anointed the head of Jesus, Luke

that she anointed the feet, and that she dried them with her hair. *They* relate the dissatisfaction of Judas on the occasion,—Luke the censure of the Pharisees and the reproof given to them. vii. 39. From all these John collects circumstances, and unites them in one relation. The description of the ointment and its value he takes from Mark, the conduct of the woman who anointed him from Luke, and the admonition to Judas from Matthew. Matt. xxvi. 7. Mark xiv. 3. Luke vii. 37. John xii. 3.

Matt.	Mark.	Luke.	John.
	ἐχουσα ἀλαβαστρον μυρου ναρδου πιστικης πολυτελους.		ἡ οὐν Μαρια λαβουσα λιτραν μυρου ναρδου πιστικης πολυτιμου,
		ἠρξατο βρεχειν τους ποδας, και ἠλειφε,	και ἠλειψε τους ποδας Ἰησου,
		και ταις θριξι της κεφαλης ἐξεμασσε,	και ἐξεμαξε
		και ἐφιλει τους ποδας αὐτου.	ταις θριξιν αὐτης τους ποδας αὐτου· λεγει οὐν. κ.τ.λ.
	ἠδυνατο τουτο το μυρον πραθῆναι ἐπανω, τριακοσιων δηναριων, και δοθηναι τοις πτωχοις;		διατι τουτο το μυρον οὐκ ἐπραθη, τριακοσιων δηναριων, και ἐδοθη πτωχοις;
	ὁ δε Ἰησους ἐιπεν· ἀφετε αὐτην· προειλαβε μυρισαι μου το σωμα εἰς τον ἐνταφιασμον.		εἰπεν οὐν ὁ Ἰησους· ἀφις αὐτην· εἰς την ἡμεραν του ἐνταφιασμου μου τετηρηκεν αὐτο·
παντοτε γαρ τους πτωχους ἐχετε μεθ' ἐαυτων· ἐμε δε οὐ παντοτε ἐχετε.			τους γαρ πτωχους παντοτε ἐχετε μεθ' ἐαυτων, ἐμε δε οὐ παντοτε ἐχετε.

SECTION LIII.

If these authors knew something of each other and of each others' works, and thus each of them formed his plan from the preceding works which existed, hoping to acquire his reward in the improvement of the history, in that case, the following argument with respect to the priority of Luke to John, is valuable and substantial: and much more so, in regard to Matthew and Mark, after whom Luke composed.

John has given to some relations a perfection, which the hastily sketched outlines of Matthew, and the annotations of Mark upon them, to which Luke adhered, did not yet possess, and which they first obtained from so acute an observer, who was foremost to the others on most occasions.

Matthew describes (xxvi. 69—75.) the denial of Peter, in which he is attentive to the matter, but not to the place or the persons who caused it. Mark trod in his footsteps, scarcely adding any thing more, xiv. 66—72., and Luke, who in many instances, adhered to them, xxii. 54—63.

John, on the contrary, very accurately specifies the place of the transaction. The beginning of the affair took place in the palace of Annas, the High-Priest; there Peter denies the Lord in the court, to which John had procured him entrance, for the first time, to the woman, who kept the door, xviii. 17. Hence John leads the procession to Caiaphas, where the other three first enter into the narrative and commence the history of the denial, whereas, according to John, he only completed in this place what he had begun in the house of the former

priest, and for the second and third time denied his acquaintance with Jesus, xviii. 25—27.

We may even observe, that, according to Matthew, another of the maids ἀλλη, according to Mark ἡ παιδισκη, and according to Luke, ἀλλος, (a man) seduced him to the second denial; but according to John there were several together, εἰπον οὐν αὐτῳ, by which he reconciles all the Evangelists.

John has here evidently completed the narrative, principally as it regards the local description of the first fact, and Luke could not have rested at the incomplete account of the two first, and have so inserted it in his book, as it was, if the work of the beloved disciple had been before his eyes.

In the history of the resurrection, Matthew is, as usual, unconcerned about the order, in which the events succeeded each other, his purpose not obliging him to it, and only proceeds to his chief object. As, at twilight, (he says,) the women visited the grave, the stone was rolled away, and an angelic vision announced to them, that the Lord had risen, telling them to apprise the disciples of it, and they hastened away. xxviii. 1, 2. Mark left this, as it was, xvi. 1—9., and so also did Luke, xxiv. 1—10.

John who himself went thither, and was in the garden and at the grave, gives us a more particular account as to the time in which the vision took place. The vision did not take place immediately, as the women came to the grave. Mary Magdalene had already been at the grave, where she found the stone rolled away, and had then called thither two of the disciples, Peter and John; during the time that they were occupied in inspecting it, she was weeping without—again entered into the sepulchre, and then beholds the men in light robes and at last the Lord himself.

Luke might, therefore, have derived essential advantage from the more perfect representation of John, and would have been obliged to adhere more to him than to his other two predecessors, if he had been so fortunate, as to have seen the book of this author, who was so highly authorized by the circumstances in which he was placed, before the publication of his own.

SECTION LIV.

THERE are such internal evidences in these books as show their antecedent existence to John, and there are such retrospects in his, as betray that he knew their contents. If then the declarations of ancient authors agree with this, they do not deserve to be laid aside in such an unfriendly manner as they have been.

Eusebius informs us[g], that John had for a long time only occupied himself with oral instruction, but when Matthew, Mark, and Luke had published their Gospels, that they were brought for his inspection, that he approved of them, attested their truth, and resolved to supply in a writing of his own all, in which they were deficient. What, however, Eusebius says of that defective part of the history which John wished to supply, is very inadequate; it is, notwithstanding clear from his own statement, that he has connected with the ancient narrative his own exegetical conjectures, which must be separated from the account which is founded upon facts.

Surrounded by different embellishments we re-

[g] Euseb. H. E. L. iii, c. 24.

ceive much the same account as to the main point from a Roman teacher, who lived about the beginning of the third century[h]. The fourth of the Gospels, he says, is that of John, one of the disciples, who, when his fellow-disciples, and the Heads of the Church besought him to write it, replied to them, fast with me. Then it was revealed during the night to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should examine the other books, or consult the other Apostles (for the text is doubtful, and was perhaps ambiguous in the Greek itself; ἀνεξεταζομενων ἀπαντων, ἁπαντα συγγραψοιτο) and that he should write the particulars in a treatise bearing his name. The fabulous part of this account will not mislead us in extricating the principal point from it; this information moreover assures us, that the same fact is here attested from a source entirely different from the former.

Without the like embellishments and much nearer to its original purity is the account of an author, who perhaps may be a little more modern than the preceding, but who has referred to more ancient teachers. Clemens Alexandrinus relates[i], when John, the last of the Evangelists, perceived, that that, which was human in our Lord, was copiously stated in the Gospels, at the instances of his friends by Divine inspiration, he also treated of his spiritual nature in a Gospel.

And what is more natural than for John who lived the longest after his brethren, (especially if the Epistles are connected with his Gospel) to have written his book late, in old age, as πρεσβυτερος, and to have seen and known the other Gospels, which were already in the possession of the world?

[h] Antiqq. Ital. Med. Œv. Muratorii, T. iii. p. 854.
[i] Euseb. H. E. L. iv. c. 14.

SECTION LV.

JOHN therefore, saw the others, and this was one of the circumstances, which determined his plan and the arrangement of his Gospel, as well as the selection of events to be admitted into it.

The first three make Galilee the theatre of their facts, and among its cities, more particularly Capernaum; there the Lord appeared for the first time, when he went forth from Nazareth, to commence his ministry. From thence, he sets out on his journey, and thither he returns, after he had gone round about Gennesareth, taught and performed miracles at Gadaris, or on the borders of Tyre, or in Decapolis. In this circuit they have enclosed his actions, out of which he did not step, until he travelled to his passion at Jerusalem.

It is different in John. He shows us in other places new and hitherto unwitnessed scenes. He leads us to Judæa, and particularly to Jerusalem: there he is far sighted, yet knowing very little of all that happened at Galilee. When the former also conduct Jesus to the borders of Judæa, there they lose sight of him, and John takes him up: his narrative accompanies him here, but does not follow him back far into Galilee, for it leaves him again on the boundaries of this country, where the historical district of the other Evangelists lies.

In the whole of John's work there is, from the commencement of the ministry to the end, only one single doctrinal discourse which relates to Galilee. vi. 22. vii. 1. and except the days of the passion, there are but three facts, which he has in common with the other

Evangelists. These are the feeding of the five thousand and the voyage on the sea which is connected with it, in which Jesus appears to the disciples in the storm and saves them, vi. 1—22., which he has repeated, because they were necessary and inalienable preliminaries to the comprehension of the subsequent instructions already noticed. Afterwards comes once more the history of Mary, who anointed our Lord, John xii. 3. which he again detailed from causes mentioned in the 51st Section.

They are therefore occupied with Galilee and the environs; but HE with Judæa and the capital. In this manner, we receive an entire account of the three last years of his life. He has, exclusively of the three facts, only written that, of which the three first had not treated, and consequently what they omitted in their works, τα τοις λοιποις παραλελειμμενα. This arrangement of the plan required him most perfectly to know what they had done, how far they had gone, and what they had left for his historical pen.

SECTION LVI.

THE three Evangelists have divided their history into journies, which took place from Capernaum; they form them into as many sections of the narrative. John arranged the events in chronological sections; six feasts of the Jewish nation are chronologically noticed, five of which Jesus kept at Jerusalem.

The first of the feasts is a Passover. ii. 13. the second is only generally called the Feast of the Jews, ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων, v. 1. The rest are again all ad-

duced under their names; the third is a Passover: vi. 4. after this is the Feast of Tabernacles; vii. 2. then the Feast of the Dedication, x. 22., and finally the last Passover.

Festivals were in the ancient world national measures of time and particularly with the Jews. Were we to disregard these, in the succession of events mentioned by John, and solely attend to local circumstances, it would be equivalent to the rejection of given definitions of time, for the sake of exciting a dispute about words. For here place and time, the festival and the holy city are inseparable: the scenes were at the festival, the festivals were in the holy city. We should be obliged therefore *merely to assume*, that the historian had placed the first festival after the last, and the whole arbitrarily; the contrary of which is most evident.

John seems to have stated only one of them indeterminately, under the general description ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων *the feast of the Jews*, v. 1.

Some were inclined to account it a Passover on account of the preceding conversation, in which the Lord, among other things, says, Say not ye, there are yet four months, and then comes the harvest? nevertheless, behold how the fields already look white for harvest, iv. 35. But the harvest began at the conclusion of the feast of the Passover, and thence it was inferred, that the next was a Paschal feast [k].

But there is a solution still nearer; and thence the inference, becomes uncertain, which could only be valid, if the Passover was the sole feast at this period. Within the four months, about one month earlier

[k] Scaliger de Emendat. Temp L. vi. p. 257. ed. Francof. 1593. Lightfoot, Horæ Hebraic. ad. h. loc.

than the passover the Purim-festival [1] occurred, which was in the most distinguished sense a feast of the Jews.

It is therefore so much the less questionable that this is intended, as a few days afterwards when Jesus had returned from that, which was thus called a feast of the Jews, the Passover began, v. 1. vi. 1—4. According to this hypothesis, the rest must likewise have so followed as John relates, namely, that the Lord suffered this Passover to pass by without visiting it, and wrought and taught in Galilee, where he had just arrived at home from Jerusalem.

But, if on the contrary, we make this undefined feast a passover as it is proposed, we entangle ourselves in a new difficulty. As our Lord staid at home over the passover, of which mention is made, a few days after his return, there was from that conjectured passover to this an entire year; and from this he did not appear in Jerusalem for six months farther, until the feast of the tabernacles, discontinuing the duty of Divine worship, in opposition to the

Respecting this opinion of Hug, Kuinoel *in loco* writes : " Alii h. l. festum Purim intelligendum esse censuerunt, v. quos laudavit *Lampius*, T. ii. p. 3. cf. et *Hugii Einleit. in das N. T. Th.* ii. p. 157. quod in xiv. et xv. mensis Adar, qui nostro Martio respondet, incidebat, atque adeò uno mense Pascha præcedebat. Contra verò monuerunt alii, festum Purim peragi potuisse in pagis et oppidis, v. Esth. 9. 18, 19. 28. Sed, h. l. esse sermonem de festo Hierosolymis è legis præscripto celebrando, ter autem quotannis omnes mares coràm Deo apparere debuisse, festo Paschatos, Pentecostes et Tabernaculorum, v. Exod. 23. 14. *Ss.* 34. 18. 22. *S.* Deut. xvi. 16., sed inter Decembrem, quo mense Jesus ea dixerit, quæ Joh. iv. 35. leguntur, et Aprilem, nullum reperiri festum à Deo institutum, quod ad iter Hierosolymam suscipiendum occasionem suppeditaverit : intelligi ergo h. l. debere festum Paschale, non verò festum Purim. Protulerunt et alia ad hanc sententiam refellendam," &c. The other ideas on the subject are also noticed by him. *Translator.*

public ordinances, for a year and a half and upwards; by which he would have exposed himself to the general censure and punishment.

Thus far our assertion is justified and corroborated. To this it is opposed; that John calls the feast in question merely and simply *feast*, ἑορτη; in which case the appellation signifies κατ' ἐξοχην, the passover, as the greatest of the feasts. Proofs of this are, as it is said in Matt. xxvii. 15. Mark xv. 6. Luke xxiii. 17. John iv. 45. But the decisive explanation, that the feast was a passover precedes every one of these passages. It was consequently unnecessary in the course of the narrative continually to repeat the word passover, but according to the custom of all languages the general term FEAST was sufficient. In like manner, John acts with regard to the feast of Tabernacles; after having referred to it by name, vii. 2., he in the sequel, only expresses himself in general terms, "he went up to THE FEAST;" towards the middle of THE FEAST; at the last day of THE FEAST; vii. 10, 14. 37.

Why do we not here also conclude, that when the word feast alone is put, we are to understand the feast of Tabernacles? The case differs in no way: nor are the above-mentioned proofs differently constituted. It was the passover; they thought to catch him; but not at the feast; but it was customary at the feast, &c.

As this objection, which is the principal one opposed to our assertion, causes no farther impediment, it would appear superfluous to add any thing by way of illustration:—nevertheless we would remark, that the historian does not call the feast in question, simply feast, ἑορτη; but ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων. The addition changes it so much, that a double explanation becomes possible; ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων may simply signify a feast

of the Jews, or by way of eminence, THE FESTIVAL OF THE JEWS. But then we might reply, that it should be called ἡ ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων. Well: but have not several and important MSS. this reading? To these we may add the Memphitic translation, which expresses this definition. And which is the most probable with regard to the historian? He has called all the feasts by their names πασχα των Ἰουδαιων, ii. 13. το πασχα, ἡ ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων, vi. 4. ἡ ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων, ἡ σκηνοπηγια, vii. 2. ἐγκαινια ἐν τοις Ἱεροσολυμοις. x. 22., if we judge him according to his custom, this may be said to be the proper name of the feast; perhaps, as it was commonly called among the Asiatics. No feast, like that of Purim, is so entirely entitled to be called by way of eminence, THE FEAST OF THE JEWS: it was the festive memorial of their miraculous preservation, FESTUM OB SERVATOS JUDÆOS. The amusements, also, which took place at it, qualified it less for a Divine solemnity, than for a national feast, יום טוב היהודים. In every respect it is most perfectly designated by the name of FEAST OF THE JEWS. It stood moreover in such high estimation among the Jews, that when they stated that the Messiah hereafter at the renovation of things, would abolish the prophets, the other holy writings, and customs, they excepted none but the law of Moses and the feast of Purim[m]. This might then be a reason, which induced

[m] Gemar. Hierosol. Tract. Megil. Cap. I. const. viii. The Megillah of the dedication of the temple will cease; but the feast of Purim will not cease בטלה מגילת תענית חנוכה פורים לא בטלו—Soon afterwards, the Prophets and the Hagiographa will be abolished; but never the book of the law. Immediately it is added: also the Megillah of Esther and the ordinances will not be abolished: אף מגילת אסתר והלכות אינן עתידים ליבטל—See a similar passage from R. B. Maiemon, in Hottinger, Thesaur. Philol. seu

our Lord, for the sake of avoiding unnecessary obstacles to the belief of his dignity, as the Messiah, on this account, to indulge the opinion of the people and to manifest his veneration by a visit to the feast.

We must yet, for the sake of perfecting the argument in the mean time call to mind that the words of John, vi. 4. ἦν δὲ ἐγγυς το πασχα ἡ ἑορτη των Ἰουδαιων, were also declared to be an interpolation. As long the learned imagined, that a passover was intended by this undefined feast, and on the other hand, saw too clearly, that a few days afterwards another passover could not immediately follow, they endeavoured to affix suspicion to the vexatious words. There were no internal reasons for this, except the dissonance with an opinion, which they accounted to be the only true one[n]. Just as little do the external reasons correspond with it; all the MSS. and all the translations bear witness against the hypothesis[o]; and in this respect cannot affect the decision, which has been just pronounced.

We have therefore the following feasts in John; the Passover, the Purim, the feast of Tabernacles, the Dedication of the temple, and the last Passover, and no more than three passovers, as

Clavis. Scriptur. L. ii. c. 1. Sect. 3. The prophetical writings and the Hagiographa will cease in the days of the Messiah; except the Megillah of Esther, which is for ever, like the book of the Law.

[n] The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Llandaff acquaints us with the whole literary history of this subject (Observations and Additions to Michaelis' Introduction, German Edition, Pt. II. p. 50.) and considers the matter as an hypothesis, as it really is.

[o] Kuinoel. Commentar. in libros Novi Testamenti histor. Vol. iii. Evangel. Johan. has very correctly (John vi. 4.) opposed to this hypothesis the agreement of the MSS. and versions.

the ancients sometimes maintained [p]. But all these three passovers do not constitute three, but only *two years* of the ministry. At the first, he made known in the holy city his dignity and his mission; during the second, as he had but just arrived from the feast of Purim, he remained in Galilee; and at the third he finished his career as a teacher. From the first to the second; from the second to the third, there are two years: perhaps six or seven weeks more, if we include the time from the baptism until the first feast of the passover.

SECTION LVII.

To give a clear view of the formation of the Gospels, the first three of which only describe scenes in Galilee, and the fourth almost exclusively details the events in Judæa, we must examine the points of contact, where they join and harmonize with each other. I commence this investigation with the confession that I have to correct a preceding error, which would have merited a severe censure.

The first three contain several journies and travels: but John contains the visits of our Lord to the feasts at Jerusalem. The question affects us with regard to both parts; which of these journeys agree with each of the five feasts, which Jesus attended in the holy city?

John advances before all of them. On the day

[p] Iren. L. ii. adv. Hær. c. 22. Apollinar. apud Hieronym. in Daniel ix. 2. Epiphan. Hæres. LI. The various and strange opinions respecting the duration of the ministry of Jesus, we find enumerated in the above-mentioned observations and additions to Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, part i. p. 51—55.

following his initiation by Baptism, Jesus was pointed out to the first disciples by the Baptist, John i. 36. on the next he went to Galilee; on the third to Cana, ii. 4. from thence to Capernaum where he sojourned a few days [q], ii. 12. and then he visited the Passover. ii. 13.

Here in the concourse at the feast, in the middle of his people, in the temple of the capital, he first announced himself with full power, revealed his dignity, and declared his mission, ii. 13.—iii. 12. When he had left the holy city he remained baptizing and teaching at the Jordan, iii. 12.—iv. until a comparison between him and the Baptist, which might have proved prejudicial to the latter, induced him to forsake these parts, whence he then proceeded towards Galilee by way of Samaria and Sichem, iv. 1—5. At Sichem he remained two days, iv. 43. and then he entered Galilee, visited again Cana, and on the road to Capernaum performed his second miracle in Galilee.—v.

How long he remained at the Jordan, we see from the conversation homewards: iv. 35; there are yet four months and then comes harvest. This occurs in the middle of April; Jesus was consequently on his journey home, towards the middle of our December, a time at which the climate in Palestine is unfavourable for occupations in the open air, and

[q] From the time of Jesus quitting Capernaum until his appearance at the passover, *i. e.* between these two seems to be comprised his forty days retirement, during which he prepared himself for entering upon his mission, which he announced and undertook at the passover. The three attacks of the tempter at the end of the forty days did not immediately succeed to each other, but took place at intervals. The second according to Matthew, or the third according to the more forcible representation of Luke, took place in the holy city, where Jesus had arrived, for the first time, after the baptism.

from the passover until this period, comprising *eight months,* he was employed in Judæa in collecting his first disciples and converts.

When Jesus, now, had arrived in Galilee and already approached the walls of Capernaum, John breaks off the narrative, as if nothing farther had happened here. He instantaneously begins; after this there was THE FEAST OF THE JEWS and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. v. 1. Did nothing then take place here? did he only arrive to depart again?

The events in Galilee are the province of the other three, in whom we must seek for them. We cite more especially Luke, as being the last of them. Jesus pays a visit to Nazareth, the place where he was brought up; he is there mistaken for another, Luke iv. 16—31., and

I. He arrives again at Capernaum.
a. Cures a Demoniac in the synagogue.
b. Goes into the house of Simon.
c. From hence he goes into Simon's ship,
d. And cures a leper.

II. Jesus arrives again at Capernaum as Mark ii. 1. more distinctly states.
a. Cures the paralytic.
b. And calls Matthew or Levi.
c. The disciples of John fast.
d. The disciples of Jesus go through the corn.

III. Jesus returns to Capernaum, Mark iii. 1. Luke vi. 5.
a. Cures the withered hand.
b. Chooses the twelve, addresses (the Sermon on the Mount) them and the rest of the multitude.

c. He cures the servant of the Centurion.

d. Jesus goes to Nain.

e. The disciples of John ask, if he be the expected one.

f. The sinful woman anoints our Lord.

g. Many follow him; Mary the wife of Chuza, &c.

h. The mother and brethren of Jesus come to see him.

i. Jesus sleeps in the storm, he comes to Gadaris,

k. And raises the daughter of Jairus.

IV. Jesus returns home, Mark vi. 1.

a. He gives to the twelve power over the Devils.

b. Herod conceives John to have risen.

c. The twelve return and relate their performances.

d. Jesus feeds five thousand.

Here, with this event, (Matt. xiv. 13. Mark vi. 35. Luke ix. 12.) John joins in the narrative, and mentions, in common with the others, the feeding of the five thousand, and the phænomenon of Jesus walking on the sea, which is connected with it. John vi. 1—22. A point of union where the historians of our Lord meet after a long separation. The fact in John took place soon after the feast of the Jews (Purim) v. 1. vi. 22., a few days before the second passover. vi. 4.

When then did the Lord go from Galilee to appear at the feast of the Jews? We have no trace of it in the first and second journey. *In the third journey of Luke* the excursion to this feast is first shewn. Our Lord gradually moves away from Galilee; his fame precedes him, in a downward direction towards Judæa, Luke vii. 17. He approaches the Sama-

ritan boundaries, and goes through Nain; for if the usual road from Galilee to Jerusalem through Samaria was taken, the road lay through Nain[r].

The Baptist hears of his approach without being able to interpret it. Several reasons may be conceived for it, which are contained in the preceding events. Our Lord had not yet left Judæa very long, and he already returned to it. But it was much too soon for the passover, which he selected when he shewed himself to the people for the first time. Could he again have intended to baptize on the Jordan? yet he had before abandoned this employment, lest he should confine the operations of the Baptist. Could it perhaps be one, or a company of his disciples commissioned to baptize in his name on the Jordan? All this was uncertain. If it were himself, respect required him to depute envoys to receive him: if it were not himself, it was yet proper for the sake of ascertaining the fact, to send somebody to meet the company.

According to Luke the company comes as far as the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, where the sinful woman anoints our Lord, for she lived at Bethany. Luke, indeed, has placed this fact too early, as we have before observed: yet his arrangement arose from his consciousness, that Jesus was on his journey to the holy city, and that he had already arrived there.

What he there performed is to be sought in John, v. 1. vi. 1. THE LORD WAS AT THE FEAST OF THE JEWS.

In the mean time, as it appears (iii. Journey, *f. g. h.*) the return begins, in Luke viii. 1, the company increases, viii. 2, 3. In the sequel, the mother and

[r] Joseph. Ant. L. xx. c. 6. with which compare the first part of this introduction. Sect. 4.

brethren of Jesus come and wish to see him, viii. 19. The motive of this desire has in the Evangelists no reason and connection. But supposing Jesus to have returned from the feast, nothing is more natural than this desire of seeing him and hearing what he had done, and what had befallen him there. The journey continues; the travellers arrived at home; soon afterwards we see Jesus on the sea of Tiberias, viii. 22. He sails to Gadaris; raises the daughter of Jairus; sends out the twelve, and after their return feeds five thousand, viii. 26.—ix. 11.

In this particular (iv. Journey, *d.*) viz. the history of the five thousand, they all, as we have observed, unite. John relates it, because Jesus having just returned from THE FEAST OF THE JEWS, remains in Galilee during the Passover, and principally, because a doctrinal discourse was connected with it, which without it was unintelligible, but was peculiarly adapted to John's object. The Lord had on that occasion spoken more strikingly than on any other of his more exalted origin and dignity, vi. 22.—vii. At the conclusion of this discourse John closes his narrative. The Passover was not yet; and Jesus passed six months more in Galilee before the next feast, and John already speaks of the conversations on the journey to the feast of Tabernacles, vii. 1.

Did nothing then take place during six months in Galilee? A great many things; after the history of the five thousand Matthew and Mark (for in Luke there is the hiatus shown in Sect. 40) continue thus. The Pharisees come, and blame the disciples for eating with unwashed hands, Matt. xv. 1—21. Mark vii. 1—14. Jesus goes into the territory of Tyre, and cures the daughter of the woman of Ca-

naan: Matt. xv. 21—29. Mark vii. 24—31., he wanders about near the sea of Galilee, performs miracles, and cures one deaf and dumb. Matt. xv. 29—32. Mark vii. 31—37., he feeds four thousand, Matt. xv. 32—39. Mark viii. 1—10. Here, Luke joins them again after the history of the four thousand. Jesus asks his disciples, whom they account him to be? Matt. xvi. 13. Mark viii. 27. Luke ix. 18. He appears transfigured on the Mount, Matt. xvii. 1. Mark ix. 2. Luke ix. 18. The disciples cannot cure a Dæmoniac, Matt. xvii. 14. Mark ix. 14. Luke xi. 37., and dispute about precedence, Matt. xviii. 1. Mark ix. 33. Luke ix. 46. All these are events which happened in Galilee partly on the northern boundaries of the country, or on the western toward Phœnicia.

After these narratives Matthew and Mark hasten towards the conclusion of the history: Jesus goes to his death, Matt. xix. 1. Mark x. 1. But in John he lives still for a long time, travels twice to Jersusalem to the *feast of Tabernacles*, vii. 1. 3. and to the [1] *Dedication of the Temple*, x. 22. and at length to the last Passover.

Without contradiction great hiatus are here evident in the first two historical books. Where are the actions between the two visits to the Temple? where are the descriptions of the journey to each of these feasts? They are wanting, and the history is here deficient in essential parts.—It would certainly be, and would have remained so, if Luke had not supplied these historical parts, which escaped his predecessors. But whilst they are solely occupied with the journey of the passion, Luke mentions two journeys yet unnoticed to the holy city, ix. 51. and xiii.

[1] τα ἐγκαινια.

22. which we have above (in Section 41) pointed out as remarkable things among the novel historical matter, which we have obtained from this author.

Let us now insert these journeys in the feasts to which they belong: the one belongs to the feast of Tabernacles; the other to that of the Dedication of the Temple: thus without violence, a whole will be perfectly and naturally formed.

We have thus joined together all the greater members of the four historical books, in one single structure; and we have solved a problem in the ground plan, which has always been considered as the most difficult; we have, as it is called in technical language, achieved A HARMONY.

SECTION LVIII.

AFTER having thus entered into the foundation of the Gospels, and analysed their constituent parts, œconomy and arrangement, their mutual connection and their mode of treating the history by comparing the one with the other, their share in the whole and historiographical character in its execution; a general result must hence be produced respecting their worth and credit, which is the last and highest aim of such an investigation.

Four men stand before us as historians, who have depicted the actions and maxims of Jesus. Two among them were not only cotemporaries, but for the most part eye-witnesses, friends and disciples of the Lord. Of the other two, who lived with HIS cotemporaries and confidents, one wrote from the mouth of that disciple whom Jesus accounted the most to be relied upon, and on whom, as on a rock,

his plans were intended to rest: the other, a man of knowledge, acquainted with the duties of an historian, and connected by means of co-operation in the designs of Jesus with his immediate disciples; who, finally, was himself in the country, at the time, on the theatre of the events, when they were unfolded, and who observed their course with attention. There could hardly be found an example,—there could hardly be an instance of a great or wise man, whose deeds have been preserved to the memory of future times, by authors so credible, as it relates to the knowledge of the subject, and by so many who were so fully competent, as it relates to the number.

These four then wrote and published their works at different times, of whom the second was acquainted with the first, and the third with the two, and the fourth with all. Each of them considered it his duty, and merit to exceed his predecessor in the exactness of the narrative. The second remodelled the writings of his predecessor in the order and chronology, and diligently studied a more careful circumstantiality, and the most immediate motives, about which the other was not anxious;—in other points, he adhered to the narrative of his predecessor, to his language and to the letter with such continual care, that we easily perceive, that his book is nothing but a collection of critical notes upon him. The third subjected every thing to new examinations, and what remained unperceived by the latter in circumstances, time, and definitiveness, and what remained to be completed in the first, or was defective in both, he added, and made in the course of the investigation a new revision of all the accounts of Jesus which were to be found. The fourth, lastly, saw all, gave the final perfection

to their accounts and to the whole history, by a collection of all that remained.

Here then there is a general emulation in correctness, precision, and truth; here are no considerations, no fear of contradicting, no forbearance, much less an understanding. The case is exactly this—the second is the critic of the first, the third of the second, and the fourth of them all, of whom, if one had dared to say an untruth, the other would have made it his business to rectify him. Where is there now any where a history like this, by means of such unconstrained efforts, by means of so many successive corrections of emulating authors, so authenticated with regard to the pure search after truth, as this proceeds from our investigations?

There is a fine passage in John Chrysostom, which I here adjoin. It is from the prologue to the Homilies on Matthew.—"How then, was not one Evangelist sufficient to say all? Certainly one might have sufficed; but as there are four such authors, who did not write at one and the same time, nor in the same place, who neither met together, nor acted in concert, and nevertheless speak as it were out of one mouth, there hence arises a stronger proof of their credibility. But, (it is replied,) the contrary rather took place: many passages convict them of dissimilarity in their accounts. This also is a greater proof of their credibility; for, if they agreed minutely in all, both as to time, place, and expression, their opponents would never believe, that they had not written their memoirs by agreement or by personal understanding. Such a similarity could not be the work of freewill. But now the apparent contradiction in minor matters frees them from such a suspicion, and is the most beautiful apology for the conduct of the historians. And if they

detail some things differently as far as it regards time and place, this also is without prejudice an argument for the truth of the matter."

Thus far Chrysostom; and we now resign these books to the Theologian and to the Dogmatist to explore, what share Higher Powers had in the composition of these works; for here, knowledge has drawn the line of demarcation, for us; what lies beyond it is in the sphere of other departments.

SECTION LIX.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN.

This writing has such a visible reference to the Gospel of John, that I cannot but conceive both as belonging to each other.

Nevertheless, according to the most recent observations, a considerable period is said to separate the two treatises from each other, and the Epistle is said to bear with it manifest criteria of later days. "The Gospel, it is said, is written with manly strength, the Epistle with a faint spirit; the Gospel betrays the strength of the best years, the Epistle, the infirmity of age: the first, the order, brevity, and precision of the most perfect possession of genius; the second, in its irregularity, repetitions, and loquacity, a decrease of memory and reflection, consequently it was a composition in old age[1]."

But upon minuter examination only the smallest

[1] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. ii. part 2. § 182. p. 309.

part of these assertions will prove to be correct. With what minuteness does John detail the discourses of Jesus, as if a single word should not escape him! As a proof let us see one discourse, which runs through four entire chapters, xiv.—xviii. There is no where any trace here of the spirited representation, into which an author projects himself, in his prime, comprehends in the outline long speeches according to their substance, and comprises them in a synopsis. With what a degree of anxious concern does he relate! how some interrupted our Lord in his discourses, how others rejoined, how he answered, how they replied, "*but he said,*" viii. 12. —ix. vi. 24—71. Let us peruse the conversations, iii. 1—22. iv. 4—42., or let us consider his tone, when he is narrating the actions of Jesus; *e. g.* the cure of him who was born blind, ix.—x. the resuscitation of Lazarus, xi. 1—46.,—does there occur in Matthew, Mark, or Luke, a history of a miracle invested with all this circumstantiality, with the opinions, objections, and behaviour of the spectators, in fine with all these complements?

Perhaps a solitary instance may form an exception; but considered upon the whole the imposing description of facts, or the representation of doctrines in few and powerful traits, such as we should observe in the vigour of a man's prime, is not the character of the book. If detail descending to minute particulars, and conversational narrative be peculiar to later years, we might well say, that the description is often prolix, although agreeable, like that of Isocrates in old age.

SECTION LX.

As the higher branch of criticism has erred with respect to the Gospel, so has it also erred with respect to the Epistle. But we must first give the true description of its contents.

After an Introduction, which we leave unnoticed for the present, the range of the author's thoughts is as follows. God is light, after whom we must strive to obtain the purifying influence of Jesus. He who thinks himself without sin is in error, he who acknowledges himself sinful, may expect the purifying influence and atonement of Jesus. We are sure, that we know Jesus Christ, if we fulfil his commandments: by this the love to God is manifested in us, and we are united with Christ, after whose example and precepts we live. Then let us walk no longer in darkness, but approach to the light by means of love. ii. 13.

I write unto you all, of all ages and stations, ii. 15. Allow not yourselves to be carried away by love of the world, for it is passing away. Decisive things are now come to pass: opponents to Christ (the Messiah) have risen from the midst of you: on which account I have written, ii. 21. Their error is, that Jesus is not Christ and the Son of God, but persevere ye in the doctrine, which ye have received, that ye may remain in union with God and Christ, and inherit eternal life. On that account have I written to you to preserve you from error and to conduct you to Jesus, ii. 28.

Through him the Father proved to us his love, by adopting us as children and blessing us through the

purifying influence. He who lives in sin is of the kingdom of the Devil, through love we belong to God, through want of love to the Devil. But when we shall have passed into that improved state, for which Jesus, out of love, gave his life, we shall love one another, iii. 19.

With a good conscience we have confidence in God, and are heard because we are obedient to his commands; these are love and faith in Christ. Abandon not yourselves to all sorts of doctrines; he is in error who does not acknowledge Jesus to have been born as Christ, and is carnally midned, which is not becoming to us, iv. 7.

Let us love one another, because God loved us and gave his own Son, that we being reconciled through love, might obtain union with God. This Son is Jesus the Saviour of the world and the Christ. By faith in him and by love we are united to God and him, and obtain a confidence devoid of fear. The love of God to us is the pattern of the love to our fellow-men. v.

If we believe that Jesus is the Christ, if we love him, and keep his commands, we are exalted above the world and its errors, as long as it refuses to acknowledge Jesus as Christ in spite of all testimony and records, and forfeits eternal life. v. 14.

The consequence of our confidence in God, is, that he listens to us; if we, therefore, see a sinful brother, who is capable of amendment, let us pray for him. He that his born again through God sins not; the world alone is wicked. But we have attained a higher degree of illumination and through Christ an union with God.

As it must be perceptible to every one from this review, the author after some introductory sentences, treats of the doctrine of faith, that Jesus is Christ and

the Son of God, and of the high value of the commandment of love; two principal positions of a totally different nature. We must proceed from this observation, if we would judge of the construction of the writing and its authority, lest we should expect from it an unity, of which it is not at all susceptible. It were, indeed, erroneous in a freely chosen work of eloquence to dilate on two different principal subjects; but not so in an Epistle, the contents of which were prescribed to a man employed in the office of instruction, by the requisitions both of time and place.

According to the general mode, the composition should be divided into two halves, one of which should be discussed after the other, and each in a separate Section; but the author adopted an arrangement of his own, and conducted both parts by the side of each other through the whole; intertwining them like two branches plucked from different stocks, turning to one and then to the other alternately, now returning to this, now to that, until he has united them by means of a conclusion.

In consequence of this arrangement he was several times obliged to return to each of the two propositions, and repeat them, if we prefer the term, but this he intentionally did. Yet, they are not mere repetitions; for he places his propositions in other points of view, he shews them in different relations, he recommends them on other principles. He most frequently adverts to the manner, in which love and faith in Christ lead to an union with him and the Father, and to the highest end of the doctrine of faith and moral practice—the contrary of which leads from them [u].

[u] The prevailing philosophy of that time boasted, as the end of its doctrinal principles, that it could effect the union of man with the

If we lose sight of the succession, in which the two propositions are alternately conducted through the whole, there is an embarrassing instability throughout, without plan and connection; but this only arises from our own fault; whereas the author in order to avoid what was common, in the manner of treating his subject, aimed at a more refined representation of it.

If we then, (as it is just,) resolve to subtract something from the alleged disorder and carelessness of this composition; and then to lower the best years of human life, and the power of more concise description displayed in the Gospel down to the discourse of a more advanced life, both might again approach to each other, and meet, though in a great, yet in an unimpaired old age.

SECTION LXI.

It is as clear as any thing can be, that the Epistle is zealously occupied with the ARTICLE OF FAITH, (to prove which John principally wrote his Gospel:) that JESUS IS THE CHRIST AND THE SON OF GOD. It is not less certain, that the Epistle contains numerous references to the Gospel, and reminiscences in sentences and words, and that it has separated itself, from its circle of ideas, perhaps less for the purpose of quitting than of accompanying it.

higher natures, by very strange means, Introd. ii. part. 2 chap. § 125. But on the contrary John aims at this in another way, for which purpose he made use of the passages, in the Gospel, respecting ἐν εἶναι, with God and Christ, μενειν ἐν τῳ πατρι—— μενειν ἐν ἐμοι. xiv. 20. xv. 4. 7. xvii. 21. which he repeats in the Epistle, ii. 24—28. iii. 6. 9. 24. iv. 12—16.

This continual reference of the Epistle to the Gospel is evident, as well in the dogmatical, as in the moral proposition concerning *love*, the collective treatment of which is taken from the Gospel. Where Jesus recommended the commandment of love as a token of Christian conduct and a sign of being his disciple, he calls this fundamental law the NEW COMMANDMENT, ἐντολην καινην, xiii. 34. xv. 12. John when he makes the transition in the Epistle to this commandment, xi. 7—11., uses the same words as an introduction to his statement, yet in the antithesis, οὐκ ἐντολην καινην γραφω ὑμιν; for he adds, it is already an OLD COMMANDMENT, being the first instruction which you received at the beginning of your Christian faith.

Love, he proceeds, is manifested by following all these commands, v. 3. iii. 22. 24. ii. 34. The passages adduced are explanations of the commandment of the love of God, as Jesus has, *verbo tenùs*, represented it in the Gospel, xiv. 15, 21. xv. 9, 10.

He who does not attend to these commandments belongs to the kingdom of darkness, whose Prince was originally an evil-doer, iii. 8—12. This is an antithesis which was also pronounced by Jesus in the Gospel, viii. 44.

God gave the highest proof of his love to us, which should be our pattern, by giving his own Son for us, iv. 9, 10. These are the words of Jesus borrowed from the Gospel, iii. 16.

The highest proof of the love of Jesus to us is, that he gave up his life for us, iii. 16. Greater love, says our Lord in the Gospel, xv. 13. can no one have, than that a man lay down his life for his friends.

We see here, that the transition, the explanation, the antithesis and the proofs, all constituent parts of

the treatise, are taken from the Gospel, or referred to it; not to mention single phrases and allusions, to point out which is the expositor's business not ours.

SECTION LXII.

In the essentially constituent parts, in the minor members and in the embellishments, there prevails every where a very designed reference to the Gospel. What particular reference then had the composer in view?

He has pointed it out in no doubtful manner in the beginning of the Epistle; "THAT WHICH WAS FROM THE BEGINNING, WHICH WE HAVE SEEN WITH OUR EYES, WHICH WE HAVE LOOKED UPON, AND OUR HANDS HAVE HANDLED, OF THE WORD OF LIFE; FOR THE LIFE WAS MANIFESTED, AND WE HAVE SEEN IT, AND BEAR WITNESS, AND SHOW UNTO YOU THAT ETERNAL LIFE, WHICH WAS WITH THE FATHER, AND WAS MANIFESTED UNTO US; THAT, WHICH WE HAVE SEEN AND HEARD, DECLARE WE UNTO YOU, THAT YE ALSO MAY HAVE FFLLOWSHIP WITH US; AND TRULY OUR FELLOWSHIP IS WITH THE FATHER, AND WITH HIS SON JESUS CHRIST; AND THESE THINGS WRITE WE UNTO YOU." &c.

The principles of the moral doctrines, which he recommends in the Epistle, the author can neither have "*seen nor handled with his hands;*" he may indeed have heard from the mouth of our Lord the doctrine that Jesus is THE CHRIST, but he cannot have "*handled*" it[x].

[x] Respecting the hypothesis that the author had in view the Doketæ, I have explained myself before in the discussion of the Gospels Note 2. § 50.

He then makes a particular point of informing the readers of the Epistle, that he writes something to them, and that he has already written it; and all this he does in the beginning of the Epistle, i. 4. *και ταυτα γραφομεν ὑμιν*, ii. 12. *γραφω ὑμιν, τεκνια.* 13. *γραφω ὑμιν πατερες—γραφω ὑμιν, νεανισκοι—γραφω ὑμιν, παιδια.* 14. *ἐγραψα ὑμιν πατερες—ἐγραψα ὑμιν, νεανισκοι.* ii. 21. *ἐγραψα ὑμιν.* 26. *ταυτα ἐγραψα.*

Who then could immediately at the beginning of an Epistle five times protest that *he writes*, and four times that *he has written* what he was only on the point of writing? Had this been done once or twice towards the end of the Epistle, as, for instance, in v. 13., where he once more asserts it, *ταυτα ἐγραψα*, it might pass; but, as we here find it, it is inexplicable, if these assertions do not refer to something else.

He writes what he had heard and seen, etc. What John has not only heard, but seen with his eyes, and handled with his hands can only be occurrences, which are comprised in the sense, already cited: viz. incidents of life, events, of which he represents himself as a witness, *και μαρτυρουμεν*. But what could they be, if they are not those which he testifies in his Gospel? If we had a choice among many historical narratives, should we not be forced to determine in favour of those, in constant reference to which the Epistle is written? John does not allow it to rest once in this way; for he likewise states the title of the book. OF THAT, WHICH WAS FROM THE BEGINNING, OF THE LOGOS — WE INFORM YOU, *ὁ ἠν ἀπ' ἀρχης*, ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ—*ἀπαγγελλομεν*. This also is the introduction of the Gospel, IN THE BEGINNING WAS THE LOGOS.— Then he adds in the Epistle; OF THE LOGOS OF LIFE, WHICH WAS WITH THE FATHER,

AND WAS VISIBLE AMONG US, *περι του Λογου της ζωης—ητις ην προς τον πατερα.* He says the same at the beginning of the Gospel; THE LOGOS WAS THE LIFE, HE WAS WITH THE FATHER, AND WE SAW HIS GLORY. In this manner the ancients cited, thus they used to quote a work; thus they mentioned the words, by which it began [y].

Respecting this he informs us, he bears witness, he writes, and has written, *απαγγελλομεν, μαρτυρουμεν, γραφομεν* and *εγραψαμεν*, when he prepared the Epistle. He expresses himself at one time in the present tense, *γραφω υμιν*, as we also express ourselves concerning a work, which we dispatch with a letter; *I treat of it in it, or I write of it in it:* at another he expresses himself in the past, ii. 14. ii. 21—26. v. 13. *εγραψα υμιν*, because then it was a transaction actually done.

If however he refers to something written,—in fact to the book concerning THE LOGOS, he explains his object, in so solemnly protesting with an asseveration thrice repeated, in the introduction to the Epistle:—*he informs us what he has* "SEEN, HEARD, AND HANDLED," *ο ακηκοαμεν, ο εωρακαμεν, ο εθεασαμεθα, και αι χειρες ημων εψηλαφησαν* [z]—*και εωρακαμεν και μαρτυρουμεν—ο εωρακαμεν και*

[y] The Jews thus cited, likewise, בראשית, אלה שמות, ויקרא. So also the Greeks where they wished to be accurate, Dionys. Halicarn. in Dinarcho. *δημοσιοι λογοι γνησιοι και ψευδεπιγραφοι.* Diog. Laert. Pherecid. L. i. c. 6. and 11. in Archyt. L. viii. c. 5. § 5. in Philolao. L. viii. c. 7. § 4. etc.

[z] The Codex Nazaræus seems to have borrowed this passage from St. John, ܚܙܘ ܥܝܢܟܘܢ ܘܐܡܪܘ ܒܦܘܡܟܘܢ ܘܫܡܥܘ ܒܐܕܢܟܘܢ ܘܗܝܡܢܘ ܒܠܒܟܘܢ ܘܐܝܕܝܟܘܢ ܬܬܠܦܘ ܙܕܩܬܐ "*Behold with your eyes*, proclaim with your mouths, hear with your ears, believe in your hearts, and *handle with your hands* the justice

ἀκηκοαμεν, ἀπαγγελλομεν. κ. τ. λ. He certifies his knowledge of the facts, of which he has informed himself by every possible means of observation, then of his fidelity and accuracy in their description and communication, or of his full historical credibility with regard to the contents of the Gospel[a]. The question is respecting the estimation, which he claims as an historian:—to confirm which he wishes to impress on the minds of the readers his personal relation to the events and the force of his testimony.

Hence, the true force of the repetitions, "I WRITE AND HAVE WRITTEN," which follow soon after the affirmation of his historical fidelity, becomes manifest. "I WRITE UNTO YOU YOUNG MEN, CHILDREN, FATHERS. I HAVE WRITTEN UNTO YOU, FATHERS, UNTO YOU YOUNG MEN," etc. What else could they imply but a dedication of the work concerning THE LOGOS to all stations and ages,—to the whole community to whom he commits and re-

and mercy" (of God.)—Αἱ χειρες ἡμων ἐψηλαφησαν is an idiom, which implies, "*we have diligently examined*:" ψηλαφαω here, as the Syriac version suggests, seems to have been used for בָּשַׁשׁ which in the cognate dialects occurs frequently in this sense. The Talmudic writers also continually thus use the Hebrew word, as we may perceive in Buxtorf: جس in Arabic and ܓܫ in Syriac have likewise an equivalent force. The Arabic version has, accordingly, interpreted the passage, و فتشتهُ أيدينا من أجل كلمة الحيا ة *Translator.*

[a] This the anonymous writer in Muratori indeed perceived; be he Caius the Presbyter, or some one else, in the beginning of the third century: quid ergo mirum, si Johannes tam singula etiam in Epistolis proferat, dicens de semetipso: QUÆ VIDIMUS OCULIS NOSTRIS ET AURIBUS AUDIVIMUS, ET MANUS NOSTRÆ PALPAVERUNT, HÆC SCRIPSIMUS. Sic enim non solum visorem, sed auditorem, sed *et scriptorem* omnium memorabilium Domini....se profitetur.

commends his writings? They now cease to be idle words and out of place. This dedication also was composed with evident reference to the Gospel. "FOR YOU, FATHERS, HAVE I WRITTEN, YE, WHO KNOW HIM, WHO IS FROM THE BEGINNING," ἐγνωκατε τον ἀπ' ἀρχης; "FOR YOU, YOUNG MEN, I WRITE, BECAUSE YE ARE CONSTANT, AND THE LOGOS OF GOD DWELLS IN YOU;" και ὁ Λογος του Θεου ἐν ὑμιν μενει. "I HAVE NOT WRITTEN UNTO YOU, BECAUSE YE KNOW NOT THE TRUTH; BUT THAT THE INSTRUCTION, WHICH YOU HAVE RECEIVED, MAY REMAIN UNCHANGEABLE IN YOU," ii. 21. 25. "I HAVE WRITTEN THESE THINGS UNTO YOU on account of THEM WHO WOULD SEDUCE YOU." ii. 26. There are perhaps few philological problems, which are so simply solved, and established in so many points.

Yet must I, in support of my assertion, answer a postulate of Bertholdt. He requires me to admit, that, if the Epistle had been sent as a supplement to the Gospel, or as an accompanying writing, it might reasonably be expected, that in the copies taken of them both would have been written together. Therefore, the Epistle should have its place after the Gospel of John in our Canon [b]. This postulate is less adapted to cause contradiction than difficulty. This scholar cannot be ignorant that they acted in the division and arrangement of the books at different times with different views, and that the earlier arrangement became obsolete and forgotten. I will not repeat things well known, but instead of it will notice some remarkable phœnomena. The Epistle to the Hebrews (as I shall state in its place) in former times, occupied its situation in the Alexan-

[b] Bertholdt. Histor. Crit. Introd. vi. pl. § 702. p. 3197.

drine Church after that to the Galatians, and in Upper Egypt, even after the second to the Corinthians. But we seldom meet with such antiquities, and only in the most ancient books. Thus far I should be justified, if I were unable to answer him. But now I am prepared to give him satisfaction. The incompetency of the Librarius, who wrote the Cambridge Codex, has preserved for us the requisite antiquity. On the front-side of the page, on the back of which the Acts of the Apostles begin, he, without indeed knowing what he was writing, wrote the Latin column of the last verses of John's third Epistle, (p. 657.) and then added the words;

Epistulæ Johannis III.
Explicit
incipit
Actus Apostolorum.

It lies here as a document before us, that the Librarius had an ancient book before him, in which the Epistles of John were placed after the Gospel, immediately before the Acts of the Apostles.

SECTION LXIII.

It would be instructive and desirable, as far as the history of the Gospel is concerned, if we could ascertain, whither the Epistle was directed, which was destined to accompany it. But the Epistle bears no superscription to any one community and no salutation in the introduction, as Paul and others have placed before their Epistles. But if we, on the other hand, consult the accounts, which have descended to us respecting the Gospel, for the sake of

discovering from them the place of the Epistle's destination, the declarations will be found unequal in value and importance. Where, indeed, did John write his Gospel?

Some accounts say at Patmos, others at Ephesus, Theophylact in the prologue to the commentaries on John, Hippolytus the younger, as he is called, in the treatise on the twelve Apostles, and others declare in favour of Patmos, to which may be reckoned a host of MSS. subscriptions, which are very uncertain authorities [c].

The subscription of the Syriac translation and of the Arabic of Erpenius declare in favour of Ephesus. To these Irenæus, a distinguished author, nearly approaches, who, it is true, does not decidedly state the book to have been composed in that place; yet he admits its publication to have taken place there, during John's residence at Ephesus [d].

The account of the author of the synopsis, which generally is added to the works of Athanasius, is very worthy of remark. *The Gospel of John* (he says) *was composed by Saint John the Apostle and beloved disciple, when he lived in the isle of Patmos during his banishment and was published at Ephesus, by Caius, the friend and host of the Apostles, of whom Paul wrote in the Epistle to the Romans; Caius salutes you* [e].

[c] Wetstein. New Testament, P. i. p. 831. Matthæi. New Testament, P. iv. p. 356. Birch. New Testament, P. i. 676. Biörnstahl's Letters, vol. vi. part 1. p. 160.

[d] Iren. adv. Hær. L. iii c. 1.

[e] Το δε κατα Ἰωαννην Εὐαγγελιον ὑπηγορευθη τε ὑπ' αὐτου του ἁγιου Ἰωαννου του ἀποστολου και ἠγαπημενου, ὀντος ἐξοριστου ἐν Πατμῳ τῃ νησῳ· και ἐξεδοθη ἐν Ἐφεσῳ ὑια Γαϊου του ἀγαπητου και ξενοδοχου των Ἀποστολων, περι οὑ και Παυλος Ῥωμαιοις γραφων φησι, ἀσπαζεται ὑμας. κ. τ. λ. Athanas. Opp. T. ii. p. 155. Venet.

Much the same is also said by Dorotheus of Tyre, a collector, who, without judgment, compiled all that he found, from whatever quarter it might come [f]. From whatever source, which is dried up for us, this account may have flowed, it yet deserves consideration on account of its circumstantiality, and also, because by keeping a middle course, it adjusts the assertions on both sides.

Let us therefore subject it to a closer examination. Let us take into consideration the facts on which it is supported, then, as to the first account, the tradition of John's residence at Ephesus rests upon valid authority [g]. The other, viz. his banishment to Patmos, is attested by himself. Apoc. i. 9. But it is objected that this is said in a poetical book [h]. This is an invalid objection, the force of which we have weighed in the sequel in the introduction to the discussion on the Apocalypse. This fact however stands not the less firm on that account.

In the two facts, circumstances are involved, which proceed analytically from them. For, if we inquire, whether John indeed composed his writing during the time of his banishment, consequently in Patmos, we perceive, that at Ephesus, being occupied with the management of a numerous community, with the care of the Churches which had been formed in the vicinity, he was less capable of dedicating his

[f] Maxima Bibliotheca Patr. T. iii. p. 421. Lugd. 1677. The Greek text of this passage is found in Rob. Stephens's New Testament, 1550. fol. before the Gospel of John.

[g] Süskind and Flatt, (Magazine for Christian Dogmatics and Morality, part ix. p. 57.) on the essay—"The Evangelist John and his expositors concerning the last judgment."

[h] Eichhorn Introd. to the New Testament, vol. ii. part 2. § 157. p. 122.

time to the composition of writings, than in an inactive banishment on a solitary rock. During this, thrown out of the circle of his occupations, he could only by means of his writings discharge the duty of teaching, which was incumbent upon him. To this we may add, that during his absence, the heretics had an open field for the attainment of their views, whom he could oppose by no other means than by a written refutation: in this manner also, is the polemical direction of his Gospel maintained by the ancients and denied by few of the moderns.

But if John wrote his Gospel during his banishment, an uninhabited island was certainly not the place where he could publish it: for this a considerable congregation was requisite, in which it would be immediately brought to the knowledge of many people, and circulated by copies. He could therefore only effect the publication, by sending the book to the continent, or to one of the cities, in which the Christian schools, mentioned by him, flourished, and in which the author had friends and acquaintances, who undertook the business.

If he cast his eye from Patmos to the cities which were calculated for this purpose, Ephesus would necessarily first occur to him, as the capital of Asia Minor, the parent school of Christianity to the circumjacent cities (Acts xix. 10.) founded by Paul, superintended, supported, and advanced by John. The choice was not then difficult, or rather, it was determined by collective circumstances.

These circumstances are contained in both the facts, which constitute the foundation of the account which the author of the Synopsis has left us. They have in themselves, on account of their internal authority, a certain value. But as an incidental event we perceive from thence, that the place under

investigation is so agreeable to the latter circumstances of John's life, that it claims the rank of a real historical tradition. It will also, as I hope, be farther confirmed, that Caius published the Gospel.

SECTION LXIV.

If then John sent his book to the continent, an Epistle to the community was requisite, recommending and dedicating it to them. Other Evangelists, who deposited their works in the place of their residence, personally superintended them, and delivered them orally; consequently they did not require a written document to accompany them.

An Epistle was therefore requisite, and as we have abundantly proved, the first of John's Epistles is inseparable from the Gospel; its contents demonstrate it to be an accompanying writing, and a dedication of the Gospel. It went consequently to Ephesus.

We can particularly corroborate it by the following observation. John, in the Apocalypse, has individually distinguished each of the Christian communities, which lay the nearest within his circle and his superintendence, by criteria, taken from their faults or their virtues. The church at Ephesus he there describes by the following traits. It was thronged with men who arrogated to themselves the ministry and apostolical authority and were impostors, ψευδεις. But in particular he feelingly reproaches it because *its first love was cooled*[i], την αγαπην σου την πρωτην αφηκας. Apoc. ii. 4[k].

[i] In this quotation the German, not the Greek, is translated.

[k] Tertullian was attentive to this characteristic reproach in the

The circumstance of impostors and false teachers happens in more churches. But decreasing love is an exclusive criterion and failing, which the Apostle reprimands in no other community.

According to his judgment, want of love was the characteristic fault of the Ephesians: but this Epistle is from beginning to end occupied with admonitions to love, with recommendations of its value, with corrections of those who are guilty of this fault. 1 Epist. John ii. 5. 9, 10, 11. 15. iii. 1. 11. 12. 14—18. 23. iv. 7—10. 12. 16—21. v. 1—3. Must not we therefore declare, if we compare the opinion of the Apostle respecting the Ephesians with this Epistle, that from its peculiar tenor, it is not so strikingly adapted to any community as to this[1]?

book, de pœnitentiâ, Evolve, quæ Spiritus Ecclesiis dicat: desertam dilectionem Ephesiis imputat: stuprum et idolothyta Thyatirenis.—*Rel.*

[1] How Augustine and some Latins call this Epistle *ad Parthos*, we may explain in the following manner. The second Epistle of John was also called by the antients, *Epistola ad Virgines*, and consequently in Greek, προς παρθενους. Clemens expresses himself thus in the Adumbrations *: *Secunda Johannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta est, simplicissima est.* Tom. ii. Op. Clem. Alex. p. 10, 11. Edit. Venit. We find in Greek MSS. the subscription προς Παρθους, in the second Epistle whence Whiston's conjecture, in the "Commentary on the Three Catholic Epistles of St. John." London. 1719. p. 6., that Παρθους was an abbreviation of Παρθενους, is confirmed. This subscription of the second Epistle appears likewise in some MSS. as the superscription; there is one such for instance in the Medicéan Library, *cod. Act. et Epp. cath. Plut.* iv. *n.* 32. as Lamy states *de erudit. Apostol. P.* ii. c. 17. *p.* 796. Epistola autem Johannis, (he says) inscribitur προς Παρθους. Mill also describes a similar one in *Proleg. n.* 1463 (it is a Huntingdonian MS., bearing, according to Wetstein, in the Acts N. 30.) *ibi epistolæ* ii^da^ *Johannis* præfixus est titulus, Ἰωαννου ἐπιστολη β' προς Παρθους. But, as the superscription to a Barbarian nation was not well adapted

* Στρωματα.

SECTION LXV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE

Is directed to a female, who is not named, but only designated by the honorable mention εκλεκτη κυρια [m]. The two chief positions, which are discussed in the first Epistle, constitute the contents of this brief address.

He again alludes to the words of our Saviour, εντολην καινην. λ. as in the first Epistle, ii. 7., and recommends love, which is manifested by observance of the commandments. After this he warns her against false teachers, who deny that Jesus entered into the world as the Christ or Messiah, and forbids an intercourse with them. At the end, he hopes soon to see her himself, and complains of the want of writing-materials.

to an Epistle which was directed to a Grecian woman, the superscription of the second Epistle was transposed as a subscription to the first, whence the Latin fathers called it *epistolam ad Parthos*. From an improper division of the words, the reading προ—σπαρθους probably arose, and then, by correction, προς σπαρθους. The superscription *ad Spartos* is found before the first Epistle of John in a Latin Bible in the Library at Geneva, which, in the eleventh century, one of the Bishops of that city presented to the church of St. Peter.

[m] Whether this female was called εκλεκτη, or κυρια, or neither of them, but should be translated *electa Domina*, as Jerome translated it, *Catal. Script. eccl. v. Joannes*, critics are not decided. She cannot have been called εκλεκτη, or else she would have had the same name with her sister, 2 Ep. 13. With respect to Bengel, who says in the Gnomon: neque dubitare quisquam potest, nisi qui stilum veterem ignorat, aut non recordatur, appellativum κυρια, Domina, extra relationem ad servos, eo tempore vix reginæ sine invidiâ dari poterat, we observe, that Epictetus asserts the contrary. Enchir. c. 62. αι γυναικες ευθυς απο τεσσαρων και δεκα ετων υπο των ανδρων κυριαι καλουνται.

The whole is a short Syllabus of the first Epistle, or it is the first in a renewed form. The words also are the same. It is still full of the former Epistle; nor are they separated from each other, as to time. The female appears before his mind in the circumstances and dangers of the Society, in instructing and admonishing which, he had just been employed. If we may judge from local circumstances, she also lived at Ephesus.

But as for the author, his residence was in none of the Ionian or Asiatic cities, where the want of writing-materials is not conceivable: he was still therefore in the place of his exile.

The other circumstances noticed in it, are probably the following. The sons of the ἐκλεκτη κυρια had visited John, 2 Ep. 4. The sister of this matron wishing to show to him an equal respect and sympathy in his fate, sent her sons likewise to visit the Apostle. Whilst the latter were with the Apostle, there was an opportunity of sending to the continent, v. 13., viz. of dispatching the two Epistles and the Gospel.

SECTION LXVI.

THE THIRD EPISTLE

Is written to Caius. The author consoles himself with the hope, as in the former Epistle, of soon coming himself, v. 14. He still experiences the same want of writing-materials, v. 13. Consequently, he was still living in the same miserable place: also, if we may judge from his hopes, the time was not very different.

The residence of Caius is determined by the following criteria. The most general of them is the danger of being misled by false teachers, v. 3, 4.

That which leads us nearer to the point, is the circumstance of John sometimes sending messages thither, and receiving accounts from thence, v. 5—8, that he supposes his opinions to be so well known and acknowledged in this society, that he could appeal to them, as judges respecting them, v. 12. οἰδατε ὅτι ἡ μαρτυρια ἡμων ἀληθης, and that, finally, he had many particular friends among them, v. 15. The whole of this is applicable to a considerable place, where the Apostle had resided for a long time, and in the second epoch of his life it is, particularly, applicable to Ephesus.

He had lately written to the community, of which Caius was a member, ἐγραψα τῃ ἐκκλησιᾳ, v. 9. If this is to be referred to the first Epistle (for we are not aware of any other to a community), then certainly Ephesus is the place to which the third Epistle was also directed, and was the place where Caius resided. From hence, the rest contains its own explanation. John had sent his first Epistle thither; it was the accompanying writing to the Gospel, and with it he also sent the Gospel. But the opponents of John, and Diotrephes at their head, sent back the present and the messengers of the Apostle, and even inhibited others from receiving them, v. 9, 10. Caius disregarded this, he exercised Christian hospitality, and proved his fidelity to the Apostle, v. 6, 7, 8.

Who was now better qualified to promulgate the Gospel among the Believers, than Caius, especially if it was to be published at Ephesus? The author of the Synopsis has ascribed this merit to him: και ἐξεδοθη ἐν Ἐφεσῳ δια Γαϊου, with which all the parts of the Epistle do not only well agree, which is not the case with unfounded accounts, where rather the contrary becomes soon visible, but they

are so peculiarly accordant, that both mutually explain and confirm each other. Whether then he or his Voucher may have augmented the tradition, by a conjecture, that he was Caius, of whom Paul writes to the Romans, xvi. 23, is unimportant, as far as it concerns the value of the whole. Lastly, it might also not be impossible, that Caius had changed his place of abode, and at a later time resided at Ephesus.

SECTION LXVII.

MATERIALS are now sufficiently prepared, even to answer this question: when was the Gospel of John published?

Destruction had already encompassed the environs of Jerusalem, when he was busy with the composition. He sometimes makes mention of it, as a person speaks of things which are past. We thus perceive from his narrative, that the plantations on the Mount of Olives, which the Lord was wont to visit, are no more; there WAS a plantation there, he says, ἦν κηπος, xviii. 1. or xix. 41.; there WAS a garden near the place, where the Lord was crucified. Bethany, also, is no more; it WAS formerly, as he expresses himself relative to it: Bethany WAS nigh unto Jerusalem, at the distance of about fifteen stadia, xi. 18.

He only once expresses himself, as if the object was still in existence: viz. relative to the mineral bath at Bethesda ἐστιν ἐν Ἱεροσολυμοις, v. 2, there is at Jerusalem a mineral bath. But this was still in existence, even after the destruction of Jerusalem, and for a long time afterwards attracted the notice of

people, on account of the remarkable rise of the springs, and on account of the colour of the water, in consequence of its mineral ingredients[n]. The spring, consequently, was not destroyed; and if he speaks of the edifice with the expression πεντε στοας ἐχουσα, we are well aware, that ἐχουσα also signifies the imperfect tense, which HAD five colonnades.

These things, however, lead us to no more accurate determination of the period. But if the Epistles stand really in this near relation with the Gospel, if the history of it is so contained in them, as we have developed it from them, we are very near to a decisive definition of the time. The Apostle in them expresses his hopes of returning, and confidently anticipates the end of his exile, and the pleasure of speaking to his friends in person: in the third Epistle he even promises himself, that such will soon be the case, ἐλπιζω εὐθεως ἰδειν σε, 3 Ep. 14. Compare 2 Ep. 12.

The terrible epoch of the reign of Domitian was then past, and already the milder spirit of Cocceius Nerva began to be felt, who liberated all those, who had been condemned on account of religion, and granted permission to the exiles to return to their homes and friends; he also prohibited all accusations on account of irreligion and a Jewish mode of life[o]. This took place at the very beginning of his reign, and in

[n] Euseb. Onomast. de locis Sacris. v. Βηζαθα.—Βηζαθα, κολυμβηθρα ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ, ἥτις ἐστιν ἡ προβατικη, το παλαιον πεντε στοας ἐχουσα· και νυν δεικνυται ἐν ταις αὐτοθι λιμναις διὸυμοις, ὧν ἑκατερα μεν ἐκ των κατ' ἐτος ὑετων πληροῦται, ἑκατερα δε παραδοξως πεφοινιγμενον δεικνυσι το ὑδωρ.—κ. τ. λ.

[o] Dio Cass. Epitom. Xiphilin. in Nerv. p. 241. ed. Hen. Steph. 8. Edit. Wechel. p. 769. Και ὁ Νερβας τους τε κρινομενους ἐπ' ἀσεβειᾳ ἀφηκε, και τους φευγοντας κατηγαγε· .. τοις δε δη ἀλλοις οὐτ' ἀσεβειας, οὐτ' Ἰουδαϊκον βιου καταιτιασθαι τινας συνεχωρησε.

consequence of these laws, the return of the Apostle was as good as decided. Since now these views and hopes are plainly expressed in his Epistles, which refer to the publication of the Gospel, its publication must have taken place in the first year of Nerva; *i. e.* in the sixty-fifth year after the death of Jesus, and if John was then nineteen years of age, it must have taken place in the eighty-fourth year of his life, about thirty-one years after the publication of Matthew.

SUPPLEMENT, &c.

A SUPPLEMENT

RESPECTING SOME DISPUTED PARTS IN THE WORKS OF THE EVANGELISTS.

SECTION LXVIII.

ON THE TWO FIRST CHAPTERS OF MATTHEW.

The authenticity of the two first chapters of Matthew was attacked almost at the same time in England and Germany, and found defenders in both nations. In quite a different point of view a man of established reputation for learning has just pronounced the narratives of Matthew and Luke to be incompatible in those sections, which relate to the birth and the first events of the life of Jesus[a]. As the question treats of so important a part of the history, an introduction for the purpose of obtaining a knowledge of these enquiries, is unavoidable.

The principal objections adduced against these two first chapters may be comprised under the following heads.

I. The genealogy of Luke evidently contradicts that of Matthew.

[a] A critical essay on the writings of Luke, by Dr. Fr. Schleirmacher. Part i. Berlin. 1817. p. 42—50.

II. The annunciation in Luke, i. 26—38. does not well agree with the account of Matthew, i. 18—22.

III. The succession and connection of facts, in the history of the infancy of Jesus in Luke, leaves no time for the visit of the Magi, and the flight to Ægypt; they render these occurrences chronologically impossible.

IV. The narrative of the Magi, in Matthew, bears the stamp of fiction. The motion of a star before certain individuals to show them the way, its stopping over a house, are phænomena, for which no astronomical theory presents palliations.

V. The infanticide falls to the ground through its internal improbability. Matthew likewise in other matters offends against Luke.

VI. Finally, these two chapters are no where quoted in the most ancient Fathers of the Church, and in some MSS. the Genealogy of Matthew is wanting.

In the first place it cannot be denied that the contradiction of the genealogies has not yet been removed. The subterfuge, that one of them represents Joseph's descent, and the other (Luke iii. 23.) that of Mary, subjects the expression to a meaning, which it has not. But let us consider the matter more closely.

In both genealogies Salathiel and Zorobabel appear; in both Salathiel is the father, and Zorobabel the son, and both are of the royal house of David. This conformity of the personal relation, in their

names in each, proves the identity of the persons in both genealogies. The time, in which they lived, likewise corroborates it.

Salathiel and Zorobabel appear in Matthew, during, and immediately after the exile. It is the same in Luke. From the commencement of David's reign there are 500 and a few years until the first return of the Jewish tribes from the captivity; from that time until Christ there are again 500 and a few years; consequently they are even periods. Luke reckons backwards up to Salathiel, three times seven generations, and from thence to David, backwards, again three times seven, as Matthew reckoned two "*Tessarokaidecads*," therefore, the generations are equal in number, and correspond with the two periods. After the first twenty-one generations and five centuries, from David, Salathiel and Zorobabel appear, and therefore exist in the period during and after the captivity. They are consequently the same persons, not only on account of their personal, but also on account of their chronological relation.

The question now is; can Salathiel be a son of the king Jeconiah, as he is in Matthew, and a son of Neri and Melchi, as he appears in Luke?

Jeconiah was not so fortunate as to possess children. Jeconiah, or Jehoiachin, (confessedly the same person, 2 Kings xxiv. 6. 1 Chron. iii. 16.) was conducted as a prisoner to Babylon, and then had no children. The second book of Kings, xxiv. 15., which enumerates his family, only informs us of the mother of the king, the wives of the king, and his eunuchs. During the captivity, his fate was more embittered by his royal dignity, than that of any common Jew. The latter enjoyed at least a certain liberty as a planter and as a labourer, but the king

was guarded in prison. There he remained until, in the thirty-seventh year after his deportation, Evil-Merodach released him[b], clothed him and placed him at his table, 2 Kings xxv. 27. When he went to Babylon, he was eighteen years old, consequently at his enlargement he was fifty-five, at which age, the prospect of children, in one so bowed down and debilitated, is at an end. Besides, in one of the prophecies of Jeremiah (xxii. 30.,) the privilege of lineal descendants is denied to him.

If then, he had children, he must have had them by adoption. In this case, Salathiel may be a son of Jeconiah, as he is in Matthew, and a son of Melchi and Neri as he is in Luke.

But, it may be replied, that the first Book of Chronicles (iii. 18, 19.) enumerates several of his sons, which renders the adoption improbable; for only the first Son was begotten to preserve the line of a person, who had died childless, and this alone was named after him, the others belonged to the natural father.

Let us therefore examine the Chronicles; the words are; "The sons of Jeconiah are Assir, Salathiel, his son—Malchiram, also, and Pedaiah, and Shenazar," &c. But Assir is here no proper name אסיר[c]. or אָסִר signifies one, who is bound, one who

[b] ושנא את בגדי כלאו authorises the supposition, that he was invested by Evil-Merodach with royal garments, and when taken in connection with the preceding words, ויתן את כסאו מעל כסא המלכים אשר אתו בבבל inclines us also to conjecture, that he was entrusted with some shadow of regal authority over his captive people.—For the *khelaat*, with which he was invested, must have doubtless been apportioned to his former rank and station, and the pre-eminence of favour, which he is recorded to have enjoyed after his liberation above that conceded to the other captive kings, almost renders this an inference from the words of the historian.—*Translator.*

[c] Surenhusius long since indulged this idea, "quia vox אסיר notata est Zakephcaton, et antecedens vox יכניהו accentû ministro,

is kept in prison. For this is the distinguishing feature in the history of the unfortunate king, viz. that he passed the greatest part of his life in prison: the restrictive relation also of בנו shows, that mention of one Son alone is made, and the first clause of the passage, signifies; "THE SONS OF JECONIAH, THE IMPRISONED, ARE SALATHIEL HIS SON," &c.

The second clause of the passage: "AND MALCHIRAM AND PEDAIAH, SHENAZAR," &c. מלכירם ופדיה ושנאצר implies also something else. Among the ancestors of Salathiel, in Luke, Melchi stands as the grandfather, and Neri as the father. The first we find here, if we thus divide the words מלכירָמורפדיה and now the passage means; AND MELCHI [d] ADDED TO

ita ut vox אסיר ad antecedentem Jechoniam pertineat." But, this rests on the assumption of the authenticity of the Masoretic system, and on the hypothesis, that it was in force, when the book of the Chronicles was written. This is manifestly too liable to objections, to be admitted as valid criticism, Hug, who seems to have been indebted to him, builds his theory on an equally precarious foundation, and like him assumes אסר to be equivalent to אסיר, for which we have no positive authority. If the passage implied, as these writers allege, *filii Jechoniæ vincti*, we should expect to find the Hebrew words ובני יכינה האסיר or האסור. The Rabbinical writers first gave the rein to their imaginations on this subject; but they merely supposed Assir to have been the first son born to him, during his imprisonment. David Kimchi says—שניהם היו בניו וקראו אסיר שנולד בבית האסורין—these authors, in general, agree that he had sons, whilst he was in confinement, and accord with Kimchi's etymology of Assir. But, they found their hypothesis, likewise, on the synonymous force of אסר and אסיר. The versions of the New Testament vary strangely in the names recorded in these genealogical tables, and the Syriac, mutilating a part of Salathiel's name, singularly combines the remainder with that of Assir—— أهيئد ملكا. Concerning the mode of harmonizing this statement with Jeremiah's prophecy, Surenhusius must be consulted.—*Translator.*

[d] This version of the passage is so manifestly incorrect, and

HIM (רמה, ἐβαλε for ἐπεβαλεν, or ἐνεποιησεν αὐτῳ) PEDAIAH, SHENAZER, &c. In this manner, we find Luke confirmed, for that the grandfather should be placed instead of Neri the father, is of no consequence in Jewish genealogies, in which, at times, one member is passed over, in the same manner, as Matthew has passed over many. Neri, indeed, might have been summoned [e] by death very early from his paternal duty, by which means they all were reckoned among the house of Melchi.

Accordingly, the Chronicles plainly declare, that, for the preservation of the royal house and the security of its posterity, the following sons, from one of the royal wives, were designed to maintain the royal race.

Salathiel is then justly represented as a son in the two pedigrees. These two genealogical lines are those of Solomon and Nathan. We will now also state the reason, why it must be so. Brothers of Jeconiah yet living no more appear in the Old Testament, the sons of Zedekiah, the Father's brother, were murdered before the face of the father, afterwards he himself was blinded; Shallum, another of the Father's brothers, was long before dragged to Egypt, and one branch after the other was torn from the stem of Solomon. In default of nearer, even more distant relations entered into the obligation of adoption [f]. The royal line nearest to that of Solomon was the line of Nathan. Solomon and Nathan were also brothers, on the mother's side, and therefore in

so foreign to the force of רמה, that it must absolutely be rejected; and it would involve the subject in still greater difficulties, if it were correct.—*Translator.*

[e] Cf. Surenhusii conciliationes de Genealogiâ Jesu Christi.—*Translator.*

[f] Michaelis' Mosaic Law, 2d Part, § 98.

the genealogical registers of David's children are continually united with each other. 2 Sam. v. 14. 1 Chron. iii. 5. Hence, Salathiel appears as a son in the Nathanian table in Luke, and in the Solomonian in Matthew.

Now we may also seek for Zorobabel, the son of Salathiel. In the Chronicles (1 Bk. iii. 18, 19, 20.) Salathiel, the son of[g] Jeconiah, has no son: in Matthew he has one, and him the one just named. But the data in answer to the difficulty lie already prepared in the passage. Salathiel is childless[h]: Pedaiah is his eldest brother, who was obliged to raise up children to him; among the sons of Pedaiah is Zorobabel, who if Pedaiah fulfilled the law, may belong to Salathiel.

Moreover, Zorobabel, as we perceive, has sons in both genealogical tables,

Josiah	Melchi
Jechoniah	Neri
Salathiel	
Zorobabel	
Abiud	Resa.

If now that which has been said of Salathiel is well founded, we know how this appearance of Zorobabel is to be accepted. He may stand as a father in the family of Solomon and Nathan. In the first, he stands as Salathiel's son, in the other he passed over to it as a Father, by means of the Levirate-nuptials, as being himself begotten from one of this description.

Henceforward, both genealogical lines proceed uninterruptedly and accord for about five hundred years, until Joseph, the Father of our Lord. Can it

[g] Cf. Surenhusium, loco citato.—*Translator.*

[h] Cf. Eichhornii Repertorium.—*Translator.*

now appear surprising, and incredible if, after such a period, the case, which formerly was not so rare, again occurs, Matth. xxii. 25.? that one family should, by the command of the law, preserve the failing stock of the other? Let us look over our ancient genealogical registers, and see how many races have for so long a time been propagated in a direct line.

In fact, we likewise find, in the New Testament, and in the history, no brothers of Joseph, no relations of Jesus, on the Father's side. He stands there so solitary, as necessarily must be the case, if he were a branch of an extinguished stock, forced into another by the law.

In this manner, only three individual adoptions are requisite in a space of a thousand years,to harmonize the two genealogical tables according to Jewish ideas and customs. And does not the chief difficulty lie in the most calamitous days of the Jewish state, in the most unfortunate times of the house of Solomon, when it may be easily imagined, that every assistance was needed to maintain it? Have we not partly historical data, and entirely the law of the Jewish constitution in our favour?

Hence, the Genealogy of Luke is not contradictory to that of Matthew; but, the former transmits to us an excellent document, which, even according to Matthew, is valuable on account of its novelty in the history, and was worthy of being recorded, because it showed the same result from another branch.

II. The words of Schleiermacher: "If our history of the annunciation be true, the doubts of Joseph and their solution in Matthew, &c[1]. are inconceivable.

[1] On the Writings of Luke, P. 1. p. 42.

The doubts of Joseph were not solved by the annunciation. If Mary discovered to him her pregnancy by narrating this occurrence, by means of which she herself had obtained the knowledge of it, her assertion, inasmuch as the matter was out of the course of nature, required a confirmation, which was not to be obtained in a common way. An extraordinary information became therefore necessary to the conviction of Joseph, and the account of Matthew (i. 20—22.) not only does not militate against it, but intervenes and completes it. Now, as soon as the mind of Joseph was set at ease, and Mary was certified of the proceeding, which he might have adopted, the journey to Elizabeth was expedient, for the purpose of discovering the token, which the angel had indicated to her, in confirmation of it. Of course, the journey must have been undertaken with Joseph's approbation, on which account, the indifference, which she displayed towards her husband by an absence of three months, must be so much the less taken into consideration, as it was Joseph's wish: since, he took her to wife, but left her untouched, until she had brought forth her first son. Matth. i. 24—26.

III. The contradictions of the two Evangelists extend further in the course of the history of Jesus's infancy. Luke relates (ii. 22. and 39.) "WHEN THE DAYS OF THE PURIFICATION OF THE MOTHER OF JESUS WERE ACCOMPLISHED, THEY WENT TO JERUSALEM, TO PRESENT THE CHILD TO THE LORD. AFTER THEY HAD DONE EVERY THING REQUIRED IN THE LAW OF THE LORD, THEY RETURNED TO NAZARETH IN GALILEE, TO THEIR OWN CITY."

Matthew gives to us quite a different account.

The parents and the child receive, in Bethlehem, a visit of the Magi, which causes their flight to Egypt; and not, until they returned, did they go to Nazareth.

Now, if the visit of the wise men took place after the presentation of Jesus in the Temple, they would not have found the child in Bethlehem, but in Nazareth of Galilee, to which place he was (as Luke says) instantly brought after this legal ceremony.

But on the contrary, if the Magi had arrived before the presentation, this could never have happened, for the flight to Egypt succeeded immediately after their visit.

Yet if we would assume, that the parents had returned from Egypt with Jesus to Bethlehem, and then brought him to Jerusalem from thence, to present him to the Lord, our assumption is contradicted by Luke, who conceives the presentation to have occurred after the forty days of purification specified by the law, and by Matthew, who assures us that they, on their return from Egypt, no more ventured to go to Judæa, ii. 22.

This difficulty, on which Stroth has insisted very much[k], has a very considerable probability.

The question is, whether the expression of Luke is to be taken in its strongest signification, whether he must be so understood that immediately after the act of presentation the parents of Jesus repaired to Nazareth. But I conceive that his expression must not here be taken in so strong a sense. Luke was accustomed, in the beginning of his history, to separate each narrative by a concluding formulary, and to determine by means of a general clause, or

[k] Repertory for Biblical and Eastern Literature, vol. ix.

frequently of a superfluous addition, what, for the most part, was already intelligible by itself. Such a conclusion, which is self-apparent, is in Luke i. 38. και απηλθεν απ' αυτης ο αγγελος, or in ii. 20. και υπεστρεψαν οι ποιμενες, etc. Also the general clause, i. 80. το δε παιδιον ηυξανε και εκραταιουτο πνευματι, and ii. 52. και Ιησους προεκοπτε σοφια και ηλικια και χαριτι. Such a conclusion then is the clause in question and must rather be taken in this quality than in that of a clause determining the time[1]. The words ii. 39. και ως ετελεσαν απαντα . . . . . υπεστρεψαν . . . . . το δε παιδιον ηυξανε, only therefore express, in general, that Jesus after this transaction, became an inhabitant of Nazareth, without on that account taking away the intermediate time, between this and the establishment at Nazareth, or denying the intermediate transactions.

IV. But the account of the Pseudo-Matthew respecting the Magi, is full of absurdities. Of what description are the astronomical phænomena of a

[1] Hug's reply to Stroth's objections is frivolous and inconsequential, and is more theoretical than critical. The paper to which he refers in the Repertorium, relates to the interpolations in the Gospel of Matthew, (p. 99.) to which no author's name is affixed, and the arguments, which are urged in it, are too unsound to be capable of establishing a contradiction between the two Evangelists. But without having recourse either to these objections, or to Hug's answer, we may presume from the accounts of the two Evangelists, that the Magi found our Saviour at Bethlehem, before the expiration of the forty days, when it was incumbent on Mary to present herself in the temple, and that Herod was not apprized of their departure, until the return to Nazareth (Luke i. 39.) when the infanticide may be presumed to have occurred, and the warning to take refuge in Ægypt to have been given. And, if we suppose the holy family to have returned at the death of Herod from Ægypt to Nazareth (Matt. ii. 22, 23.) the history of the one writer in no respect is opposed to that of the other.—*Translator.*

star proceeding step by step before a person, and fixing itself above the roof of a house, etc.

Let us examine. The Magi came from the East; ἐξ ἀνατολης. The eastern countries with reference to Palestine are the Desert of Arabia, Mesopotamia and Babylonia. In Babylonia astronomy was peculiarly in its element, as well as astrology, or the art of investigating and presaging from the stars the fate of man. It was therefore here, that this star fraught with importance was observed.

The Magi were originally Persian sages, who were transplanted with the dominion of the Persian kings to Babylon. But afterwards the appellation of Magi was commonly used for Theurgics, astrologers, and sooth-sayers. The star announces to them the birth of a great king, of a more than mortal nature whom they sought, for the purpose of presenting to him their homage, and adoration [m].

The star which, according to their theory, denoted this, went before them. But does not προαγειν also mean, to conduct a person? to be his guide? And in the East, on account of the heat of the day, are not journeys performed by night, by the guidance of the constellations?

The star continued to be their guide, until it stood over the place where the child was. But it is inconceivable, how a star could fix itself exactly above a house. Yet, is it true; however here it is only said; *It stood above, where the child was,* ἐπανω οὐ ἠν το παιδιον. This *above* might as well signify ABOVE THE COUNTRY, as above a house.

This is also the meaning of our record, if we will explain it from the ideas of its age and from the

[m] Ideo Magi, qui forte Athenis erant, immolaverunt defuncto (Platoni,) amplioris fuisse sortis, quam humanæ rati. Senec. Ep. 58.

theories of these sages. Every man, they said, is born under a certain planet; this is the star of a man, εἰδομεν τον ἀστερα αὐτου.

For, from *East* to *West* are the signs of the Zodiac, and towards the *South* and the *North* are twenty-four other constellations, which cause a peculiar temperature of the atmosphere. This suffers a material change by the distance or approach of the planets to them, which are decisive, at the moment, in which a child is formed, quickened, or born. They determine his talents, virtues, greatness, his actions, and their consequences.

As the fate of an individual is governed by his planet, so are whole nations under the guidance and protection of the constellations under which their country is situated, and the alterations, which occur therein through the planets, decide their welfare and their misfortune*. The Jewish king therefore was to be discerned in the planet of his nation, as its Blesser.

* Cicero has developed their doctrine, de Divinat. L. II. c. 42. p. 277. Bipont. But Manilius has treated, the most copiously, of the astrological theory of the Chaldæans, from whom we here borrow the proofs. Astronom. L. IV. v. 697. sq.

Hos erit in fines orbis, pontusque notandus,
Quem Deus in partis, et singula dividit Astra,
Ac sua cuique dedit tutelæ regna per orbem
Et proprias gentis, atque urbis addidit altas;
In quibus efferrent præstantis sidera vires.
Sic divisa manet tellus per sæcula cuncta;
E quibus in proprias partis sunt jura trahenda.
Namque eadem quæ sunt signis commercia servant,
Utque illa inter se coëunt, odioque repugnant,
Nunc adversa polo, nunc et conjuncta trigono,
Quæque alia in varios affectus causa gubernat,
Sic erit et sedes fugienda, petenda cuïque,
Sic speranda fides; sic et metuenda pericla, etc. etc.

If now they only knew to which nation that asterism[o] belonged, in the neighbourhood of which the royal constellation was perceived, it was, according to their theory, the point of view, the datum, for finding out that which was unknown, for seeking the nation corresponding to it and its king. The star was their natural guide.

That it was not a sufficiently definite guide to shew a house or a place, but only the nation and country, is proved by the narrative. Otherwise, how could they still have been obliged to make inquiries in the country; *Where is he*, who is born king of the Jews? ii. 2.

If then, after they had discovered the child by enquiry, the star, which was their guide on the journey, stood above the place where he lay, it must have stood over THAT PART OF THE COUNTRY to which this good fortune was allotted, not over *a house*[p]. Now indeed the sight of the star must

[o] Hug so indiscriminately applies to this celestial phænomenon, the terms *Gestirn, Stern, and Sternbild*, that consistently with a just translation it is impossible to avoid the want of definition, to be observed in its designation.—*Translator.*

[p] From the extension of the title through various countries, it will be impossible to determine the actual place, from whence the Magi proceeded. The term likewise was so indefinitely used both by the Jews and by the Greeks, that the difficulty is considerably increased, and every research made on the subject, although it be correctly founded on the few data, which Matthew has produced, and corroborated by the phraseology of the old Testament, must therefore be too inextricably involved in hypothesis, to be received as a decided answer to the inquiry. The doctrines also of these sages are very imperfectly described in this supplement: they are far better discussed in the words of Kleuker, Creuzer, and Görres. The celestial phænomenon, which guided them, was too far removed from the ordinary course of nature, to be capable of any illustration from astronomical principles: those writers, therefore, who seek to

have filled them with all that joy, which the Evangelist describes, because it was the proof of the correctness of their discovery and the confirmation of the truth of the accounts, which they had received, and of their theory at the same time, ii. 10.

V. The infanticide at Bethlehem, it is objected, is at all events, even admitting the most barbarous extent of Herod's cruelty, an event which was not altogether conceivable. For, how much more readily might he have obtained his end! how easy must it have been for him to discover, to what part of so small a place as Bethlehem [q] the strangers had brought their presents, etc [r]. The case is so, if we only take his cruelty into consideration. But this

develop it by them, or failing in the attempt, to deny the narrative, evidently detract from it that miraculous property, which the Evangelist had ascribed to it. Of this nature are Stroth's remarks in the treatise before cited. "A star, which appears in another country, which moves along before certain people, so that the change of its situation is visible, step by step, and which afterwards stands still exactly *over a house*, (though it is impossible to distinguish with a flying paper-kite, whether it rests over this or that house) is a physical impossibility. This is so evident, that a closer analysis of it would be a censurable distrust of the reader's judgment." *Von Interpolationen in Evangelium Matthæi.* part i. p. 137, 8.—*Translator.*

[q] Some perverted traditions of this infanticide may be found in the Rabbinical works, and both Wetstein and Vossius have accounted for the silence of Josephus. One of the Rabbinical statements affirms King Yannai (ינאי) to have ordered the murder of the Rabbin, from which Jehoshua (Ἰησους) escaped to Alexandria, another assigns the murder to Herod, from which Baba the son of Buta alone is said to have been rescued. A similar legend is circulated respecting the King of China and Zerdusht, and Macrobius has alluded to the historical fact, with the embellishment, that Herod's own son was *then* slain among the rest. Cf. my Bibl. Mem. Theol. Review, No. iii. pp. 196, 197., and Toldoth Jesu, where it is also noticed.—*Translator.*

[r] Dr. F. Schleiermacher on the writings of Luke, part i. p. 44, 45.

was for the most part but the effect of his mistrustful disposition, which increased with his years, and towards the end of his life reached its highest pitch[*]. Now he had just been deceived by the Magi respecting the child, and attacked in his most sensitive point, so that it would have been improbable, if in this history, he had again depended upon inquiries and searches. He therefore acted, according to his custom, cruelly from mistrust.

Matthew, it is farther said, is opposed to Luke in regard to Joseph's place of residence; he knows not, that his dwelling-place was in Galilee, and that he only casually prolonged his stay in Judæa; because Mary was delivered there. He rather supposes Joseph to have been entirely an inhabitant of Judæa; according to this supposition Joseph, when he quits Egypt to go home, travels to Judæa, and does not direct his steps to Galilee, until he is dissuaded from his intention. But does it follow, that Matthew is so absolutely wrong? Let us for once reverse the matter. Joseph appears rather to have resided by chance in Galilee, for he was summoned to Judæa, on account of his family and descent, εἰς την ἰδιαν πολιν, that he might be enrolled in his local register. This declaration of Luke plainly confirms the opinion of Matthew. If, moreover, Joseph did not trust much to Archelaus, the cause of this was evident. This prince had at the very commencement of his reign, massacred some thousands at the Passover in the Temple for suspicious movements, which Herod had never done, and which hitherto never had happened. Jos. Antiq. L. XVII. c. 9. n. 3. de Bell Jud. L. II. c. 1.

[*] Joseph. Ant. L. XVI. c. 7. n. 3. ἐκακουτο δε ταις ὑποψιαις, και χειρων ἀει γινομενος ἀπασιν κατα παντων ἀπιστευεν. Ant. L. XVI. c. 8. n. 2. n. 5.

n. 3. The cruel deed must have sounded to Joseph so much the more horrible, upon his arrival in the land of Israel, as it had been just committed, and as it still filled every one with consternation.

VI. Finally, it is likewise adduced among the grounds of objection, that some MSS. do not contain this genealogy, and that the most ancient fathers of the Church seem to have known nothing of these chapters of Matthew.

Belthusen, however, has denied it from Irre's MS. to which reference has been made [1], and the Harleian with Uncial letters which Dr. Griesbach places in the sixth or seventh century, has the addition, on which so much stress has been laid, namely the words of the Genealogy; Genealogia hucusque. Incipit Evangelium secundum Matthæum, not from the first but from a later hand, and only in the margin. [2].

The Ebnerian manuscript at Nürnberg would then be the only one, on which the antagonists of these chapters could support themselves, in which probably, on a nearer examination, as in the Harleian, the circumstances of the fact are different. The examination has, indeed, been undertaken since the first publication of this work. Dr. Gabler paid due attention to the doubt, which I have expressed here, and discovered the misunderstanding, which gave rise to it. The result of it is, (let me express myself in his own words, Journal for Theol. Literat. vol. 2. part 1. 1801.) *It is, therefore, decided, according to this collation, that the Ebnerian MS. of*

[1] The authenticity of the first and second chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel vindicated. London 1771. p. 5.

[2] Griesbach Symb. Crit. T. i. p. 309.

the New Testament contains the first chapter of Matthew.

Of the same tenor are the proofs which have been grounded upon the silence of the fathers of the Church. It is possible, that Ignatius the martyr, knew the account of the star, etc. (which was not unknown to him,) from a tradition; but we do not concede to Stroth, that Justin has derived the accounts relative to it which we find in him, from any other source, than from Matthew.

Justin relates the whole history of the first two chapters in the dialogue with Trypho, p. 86, 87. Rob. Steph. cap. 78. The narrative is freely composed; but yet it bears undeniable traces of its derivation from Matthew.

Matthew.	Justin.
ἰδου, Μαγοι ἀπο ἀνατολων παρεγενοντο εἰς Ἱεροσολυμα λεγοντες,	ἐλθοντων ἀπο Ἀραβιας Μαγων,
που ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεις βασιλευς; εἰδομεν γαρ αὐτου τον ἀστερα ἐν τῃ ἀνατολῃ, και ἠλθομεν προσκυνησαι αὐτῳ·	και εἰποντων, ἐξ ἀστερος του ἐν τῳ οὐρανῳ φανεντος ἐγνωκεναι, ὁτι βασιλευς γεγεννηται ἐν τῃ χωρᾳ ὑμων, και ἠλθομεν προσκυνησαι αὐτον·
και συναγαγων παντας τους ἀρχιερεις ... οἱ δε εἰπον αὐτῳ· οὑτω γεγραπται δια του προφητου.	και ἐν βηθλεεμ των πρεσβυτερων εἰποντων, ὁτι γεγραπται ἐν τῳ προφητῃ οὑτως.
και συ Βηθλεεμ, γη Ἰουδα, οὐδαμως ἐλαχιστη εἰ ἐν τοις ἡγεμοσιν Ἰουδα· ἐκ σου γαρ ἐξελευσεται ἡγουμενος, ὁστις ποιμανει τον λαον μου, τον Ἰσραηλ.	και συ Βηθλεεμ, γη Ἰουδα, οὐδαμως ἐλαχιστη εἰ ἐν τοις ἡγεμοσιν Ἰουδα· ἐκ σου γαρ ἐξελευσεται ἡγουμενος, ὁστις ποιμανει τον λαον μου.

How does it now happen, (to abandon all the rest,) that Justin, in his narrative, adduces in this place, the same text from the Old Testament which Matthew applied to it, that he did not take it from the Seventy, from whence he has however taken all the preceding citations of the Old Testament, that he quotes it with the same deviations from the Seventy, as Matthew, and that he translated it with the same deviations from the Hebrew, word for word, as Matthew has translated it? that, for instance, לא היות for להיות suggested itself to him, as to Matthew? etc.

Matthew.	Justin.
και ἐλθοντες εἰς την οἰκιαν,	
και πεσοντες προσεκυνησαν αὐτῳ, και ἀνοιξαντες τους θησαυρους αὐτων προσηνεγκαν αὐτῳ δωρα, χρυσον, λιβανον, και σμυρναν .... και χρηματισθεντες κατ' ὀναρ μη ἀνακαμψαι .... δι ἄλλης ὁδου ἀνεχωρησαν εἰς την χωραν αὐτων.	των δε ἀπο Ἀραβιας Μαγων ἐλθοντων εἰς Βηθλεεμ, και προσκυνησαντων το παιδιον. και προσενεγκαντων αὐτῳ δωρα, χρυσον, λιβανον, και σμυρναν... και ὁ Ἡρωδης, μη ἐπανελθοντων ... ἀλλα κατα τα κελευσθεντα αὐτοις, δι' ἄλλης ὁδου εἰς την χωραν αὐτων.
και ἀποστειλας ἀνειλε παντας τους παιδας τους ἐν Βηθλεεμ.	ἀπωλλαγεντων παντας ἁπλως τους παιδας τους ἐν Βηθλεεμ ἐκελευσεν ἀναιρεθηναι.
Τοτε ἐπληρωθη το ῥηθεν ὑπο Ἱερεμιου του προφητου λεγοντος· φωνη ἐν Ῥαμᾳ ἠκουσθη, κλαυθμος και ὀδυρμος πολυς, Ῥαχηλ κλαιουσα τα τεκνα αὐτης, και οὐκ ἠθελε παρακληθηναι, ὁτι οὐκ εἰσι.	και τουτο ἐπεπροφητευετο μελλειν γινεσθαι δια Ἱερεμιου εἰποντος· φωνη ἐν Ῥαμᾳ ἠκουσθη, κλαυθμος και ὀδυρμος πολυς, Ῥαχηλ κλαιουσα τα τεκνα αὐτης, και οὐκ ἠθελε παρακληθηναι, ὁτι οὐκ εἰσι.

The similarity of expression more than once betrays the source, from which Justin derived his account; but the citation from Jeremiah decides it. How indeed does it again happen, that Justin in relating it selects from the Old Testament, as a prophetical counterpart to it, exactly the same passage as Matthew selected? that he, like the latter, abandons the Seventy contrary to his custom, and translates the Hebrew like Matthew, uniformly in every syllable? that he has done this twice in a short narrative?

Does not Irenæus moreover relate in the ninth chapter of the third book, the entire contents of Matthew ii. to iii., explicitly naming his source? Do we not find the same in Tertullian in the ninth chapter of the fifth book against Marcion?

If Justin's scholar, Tatian, also omitted the genealogy of Matthew in the Monotessaron, can we infer any thing from it? Did he not likewise omit that of Luke?

It is worthy of our notice, that care was taken and attempts made to harmonize the genealogies at an early period, before the third century, on account of their contradiction. Julius Africanus refuted these hypotheses of his predecessors[x], for the sake of attempting a new one. This frank and acute critic, (for such he was, as the letter to Origen respecting the history of Susanna proves) found so little authority in the MSS. of the Bible, then in circulation, to separate this chapter from Matthew and to avoid the difficulty in this most summary way: so little also did his predecessors find it, that he and they were satisfied with the most forced explanations.

But would it not even have been missed, if Matthew,

[x] τας μεν των λοιπων δοξας ὡς βιαιους και διεψευσμενους ἀποδειξας. Euseb. H. E. L. I. c. 6.

who, produced the proofs before Jews, that Jesus was the Messiah, had forgotten to show, that he belonged to the house of David, which the Jews considered as his primary characteristic?

Do not then, the mode of treatment and the peculiar style, which distinguishes him in his whole book, predominate, also, in the quotations from the Old Testament, which occur in both chapters?

MARK XVI. 9. TO THE END.

SECTION LXIX.

MANY MSS., formerly, ended the Gospel of Mark with ἐφοβουντο γαρ, xvi. 9. and contained from verse 9, ἀναστας to the end, nothing of all that, which we now find in the printed books. Illustrious and Great men of the fourth century, declare this, such as Gregory of Nissa in Cappadocia in his second discourse upon the resurrection, in which he says, that in THE MORE CORRECT COPIES, the Gospel of Mark ended with the words ἐφοβουντο γαρ, and Jerome, who appeals to almost all the Greek MSS., in which according to his testimony, the section from xv. 9. to the end was no where found. Quæst. ad Hedib. Quæst. 3.

It is doubtful, from the assertion of the first teacher, whether THE MORE CORRECT COPIES did not contain this narrative; but the matter becomes still more urgent by the account of the latter, who even refers to the majority of the MSS.

He however restricts his deposition with regard to the number itself, and asserts that *in quibusdam exemplaribus, et maximè Græcis codicibus*, we meet with a considerable variation in this disputed section, after the fourteenth verse, whence it appears, that numerous Greek MSS., were

not wanting which contained this part of the history, and that in the first passage something must be allowed for the oratorical language of the energetic Father. Dial. ii. adv. Pelag. c. 15. But what then are THE MORE CORRECT COPIES of the learned men at Nissa? Are they carefully written copies? So he seems to understand them; but in the decision of this question, it does not depend on the more careful copyist, but on the critic, who has established the reading,—on the question,—"of what recension are the MSS?" Of the recension of Origen? of Hesychius? or Lucian? They certainly were not of the recension of Origen, or of that of Palestine, for Victor of Antioch and the Scholiasts agree, that the Παλαιστιναιον Ἐναγγελιον contains the section [y]. The books of Lucian's recension also contain the whole of it; respecting the Egyptian recension cannot we assert the same?

Their more distinguished documents, the MSS. CL. the version of Lower Egypt; among the Fathers who follow this text, Dionysius of Alexandria [z], and Athanasius the younger, author of the Synopsis, recognize this Section. But the Vatican MS., the most ancient that we possess, here deviates from its recension, and excludes it. This deviation can only be indeed ascribed to the private opinion of the Calligraphist; nevertheless, this conduct, at least,

[y] Matthæi Nov. Test. T. II. Animadv. ad Marc. xvi. 9. seq. p. 266. Birch. Nov. Test. Adnot. ad hunc loc. p. 316.

[z] The passage is in his *Epistola Canonica*, to which Photius frequently refers in the *Nomocanon*. It is also in the preface, (*Voelli et Justelli Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, T. II. p. 794.) where, however, προς Βασιλιδην should be read. Cf. also, Tit. iii. c. 18. 19. 21. T. vii. c. 3. xiv. c. 5. But it exists entire in Zonaras, (*Epistol. Canon.*) with his and Balsamon's illustrations, in *Bevereg. Pandect. Can. Oxon.* 1672. *fol.* and after the works of Gregory Thaumaturgus, Macarius, and Basil.—*Opp.* 1622. *Paris.*

argues, that he must have been acquainted with books, which induced him to this critical encroachment.

If we go farther back to the times of the κοινη ἐκδοσις, we shall find that the Greek text of the Codex D., has the section under investigation, as far as the words, (v. 15.) παση τη κτισει. These together with the rest time has destroyed, and a more recent hand has restored. The most ancient teacher who refers to them, is Irenæus, adv. Hær. L. III. c. 10. "In fine autem Evangelii ait Marcus; et quidem Dominus Jesus, postquam locutus est eis, receptus est in cœlos, et sedet ad dextram Dei." The next is Hippolytus at the very beginning of his Book περι χαρισματων, which is enumerated among his works on his celebrated marble pulpit [a].

With him the Peschito agrees, as also the Latin version of the first period; indeed the beautiful but very much injured MS. at Verona is deficient in the passages after, xvi. 7.; the more elegant and less injured book at Brescia, of a mixed text, has experienced a still greater loss, and ends with xv. 66.; but the better preserved books of Vercelli and of Korwey, Augustin, Ambrose [b], and Leo the Great, who made use of the more ancient translation, are witnesses for the historical part in question.

The Sahidic version has here, through the decay of the MS., a considerable hiatus, which Woide fills up from cod. Askew, from whence it is very evident, that the Valentinians read this section; but not that the version of Upper Ægypt contained it.

[a] In Clem. Rom. we shall seek in vain for the passage, to which some editions of the New Testament refer. It is in Pseudo-Clemens, Constitut. Apost. L. VIII. c. 1. As far was I also from finding a passage in Justin the Martyr: there is also none in Clemens Alexandrinus. It must only occur in a Catena.

[b] The chief passage is in Ambros. Exposit. in Lucam. L. x. fin.

So little do the MSS. and versions, as far as they have descended to us uninjured, disown the Pericope, yet it, notwithstanding, continues doubtful, whether several antient MSS. contained this part of the history, from the testimony of Jerome and Gregory of Nissa, from the Vatican MS., and Cod. 137, 138; both of which mark the passage with asterisks, and from a Scholion, of which we shall speak directly. Something of the same sort is asserted in the CANONES of Eusebius, which are only continued as far as ἐφοβουντο γαρ [c]. This circumstance however is of no such importance as some believe. The CANONES do not inform us of the condition of the MSS., but only of the Harmony of Ammonius, the parts of which Eusebius means to point out in the common evangelical books by this precaution. If, therefore, the CANONES end here, it is because Ammonius had not the section, consequently it could not be pointed out.

That formerly the section was wanting in many books, is established by documents: the phænomenon is confirmed by the fact of it being almost lost in the revised text. Whence do we explain this? Were they indeed pressed by exegetical difficulties? and did they endeavour to rid themselves of the section, from inability to reconcile it with the other Gospels, by means of an arbitrary stretch of critical power?

A confession of this sort is made by Jerome: the Latins could not well reconcile the contradictory assertions of Matthew, *vespere* [a] *sabbati*, and of Mark,

[c] Schol. Cod. apud Birch ἑως ὡδε—Ευσεβιος ἑκανονισεν. In the celebrated Alexandrine codex, the numbers actually extend only as far as ἐφοβουντο γαρ.

[a] From the time, when the day commenced among the Jews, τῃ ἐπιφωσκουσῃ in Matthew answers to ⟨Syriac⟩ and ⟨Syriac⟩ in Syriac, which has an equal reference both to night and day. In Assem. Bibl.

mane sabbati, and sought in the MSS. of Mark, which wanted this section, an excuse to remove

O. T. iii. p. ii. p. 3. we hence read בלילא דנגה *in the night, which dawned.* The definite period of *the dawn* in Matthew proves that there is no contradiction between his words and the πρωϊ πρωτη of Mark; the only difficulty must necessarily exist in the use of ὀψε, which however is used by the LXX in Is. v. 11. for בנשף *in the twilight* or *dawn*, and in this sense perfectly harmonizes with the other members of the sentence. The Jews divided their night into four greater hours or watches; their day, whether that of a festival or the common day, began at the setting of the sun, and ended at the setting of the succeeding sun. Rashi says, that some only admitted three watches, although others admitted four. The first watch was רוש אשמרות, ὀψε, from the sixth to the ninth hour, which was called ביאת השבת or בקר, *the morning or entrance of the Sabbath*, the πρωϊ πρωτη of Mark most decidedly. When the twenty-four hours had elapsed, came the מוצא חשבת or ערב, *evening or departure of the Sabbath*, which could not have been the ὀψε of Matthew, because this from the context being that of a festival, was *primo mane:* for שבת הערב *Sabbatum vesperæ*, must carefully be distinguished from ערב השבת *vespera Sabbati:* the first occurred at the sixth hour in the evening, the other, which was the חג or שבת־חנינה, *at break of day.* The בין הערבים, or *between the two vespers*, was, therefore, from the commencing one to the concluding one. Hence, Maimonides (שבת c. v. 18, 19, 20.) says, שבתות של ערב ביאת השבת ערב משת שקע השמש שבתות של חנינה ביאת חג או שבת בקר כמוצא השמש:

"The *Sabbatum Vesperæ* is the entrance of the Sabbath, in the "evening, when the sun sets: but the Sabbath of a festival is the "ENTRANCE OF THE FESTIVAL OR SABBATH, IN THE MORNING, as the "sun begins to rise." This, therefore, harmonizes the Evangelists, and is the ὀψε σαββατων, ἡ ἐπιφωσκουση εἰς μιαν σαββατων in Matthew, as well as the πρωϊ πρωτη σαββατου, in Mark; (Cf. Bücheri Antiq. Ev.) for the account of both relates to the same division of time, viz. that part *between the two vespers*, when the dawn took place: hence, we find in the Syriac version that it was *in this vesper*, בהדא ערבתא—in the Arabic, *in this vesper* في هذه العشية احد السبوت and still more definitely in the Æthiopic, it was *in the vesper of the Sabbath* ለጸጌሐ፡ ሰንበት as well as in the Coptic ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧⲟⲟⲧⲉ ⲛ̀ⲥⲁⲃⲃⲁⲧⲟⲛ. —*Translator.*

that, which they could not adopt[*]. Let us suppose, that the MSS. might not have formerly offered this excuse: might not the Latins have been induced, by the doubts here cited, critically to suspect the section, and to mark the place, in which they might be perplexed, with the signs of rejection? Transcribers could not in that case have been wanting who, from convenience, entirely omitted the passage.

If, however, this were the mode of procedure, the section must have been wanting in the MSS. of the Latins; but according to Jerome, not these, but the Greek books were without it. The other declarations also refer to Greek MSS. But the Greeks were not acquainted with this difficulty. Gregory of Nissa explains, in the already mentioned discourse, the ὀψε σαββατων quite correctly, from the phrases ὀψε καιρου, ὀψε της ὡρας, ὀψε της χρειας. No other difficulties exist in the section of Mark, which cannot be as well urged against Matthew, and partly against Luke, if collated with John. Consequently, no solution can be furnished from this quarter, and we must scrutinize the passage itself for the requisite explanation.

The discourse of Mark is not so irregular and confused, to warrant us in expecting from him so awkward a conclusion of his work, as is at v. 8. ἐφοβουντο γαρ.

[*] Hujus quæstionis duplex solutio est; aut enim non accipimus Marci testimonium, quod in raris fertur Evangeliis, omnibus Græciæ libris pene hoc capitulum in fine non habentibus, præsertim cum diversa atque contraria cæterum Evangelistis narrare videatur; aut hoc respondendum, quod uterque verum dixerit: Matthæus quod Dominus surrexit *vespere* Sabbati, Marcus autem, quando eum viderit Maria Magdalena, id est *mane* primo Sabbati etc. ad Hedib. quæst. 3. Opp. Hieron. T. 1. p. 825. edit. Vallarsii. F. Matthæi Nov. T. tom. iv. p. 268. f.

As we easily perceive, this is no conclusion, but a preparation for a succeeding clause.

Let us consider, how imperfect his account of the resurrection would become by this conclusion. The women came to the grave, found the stone rolled away, were addressed and apprized by a youth, in white robes, that Jesus had risen, and were commissioned to communicate to the disciples this account and the commandment, that they should go to Galilee, where they would see the Lord. BUT THEY REPLIED NOT A WORD, FOR THEY WERE AFRAID. Thus would the book end. If he ended it with these words, he concluded the most important circumstance for Christianity by the assurance, that nothing was known at that time of the resurrection, that it was not even possible to know any thing about it, as they, on whose declaration the fact depended, communicated it to nobody. He himself is moreover required to show, how he in this case knows and writes what happened to the women, if they had mentioned it to no one. What an inconceivable want of consideration in so important a matter! If he did not intend to confirm the event by farther testimonies, he ought at all events to have led the reader so far as to be understood, in what manner the occurrence with the women became known and promulgated. Then he would have, at least, adduced a proof from the declarations of the witnesses, even though it were the most feeble of those, with which we are acquainted.

This, then, is exactly the part of the history, to which some wish to dispute the author's claim, viz. the account how the women mentioned that which had happened to them, how the disciples were so soon convinced by their statement, and by what further process they obtained a clear and perfect knowledge of the fact.

How incorrect, if the book ended with ἐφοβουντο γαρ, it would be, both in regard to grammar and matter, even those Greeks perceived, who did not admit the section, for some of them added a conclusion of their own, which at least satisfied the most urgent claims which could be made upon the author: παντα δε τα παρηγγελμενα τοις περι τον Πετρον συντομως ἐξηγγειλαν. Μετα δε ταυτα, και αὐτος ὁ Ἰησους ἀπο ἀνατολης και ἀχρι δυσεως ἐξαπεστειλε δι' αὐτων το ἱερον και ἀφθαρτον κηρυγμα της αἰωνιου σωτηριας. Schol. Cod. L. et in marg. versionis Philoxen. Let us, however, on this point, hear the Master in matters of criticism upon the New Testament. He calls the conclusion ἐφοβουντο γαρ *clausulam abruptissimam*, and farther declares *omnibus incredibile videri debebat, Marcum sic finivisse commentariolum suum*[t], &c.

Thus far have we arrived: — it is acknowledged that the conclusion is abrupt, the book, as to grammar and matter, incomplete, if Mark, at xvi. 8., terminated the work. If we suppose the work to have really terminated thus, the author must have been suddenly surprised by death, or interrupted by the death of his Voucher. In the first case, the work had not to expect from him any farther assistance; in the other case, it was not only possible, but also his duty, not to have left it in this state, and as soon as circumstances permitted, to have properly concluded it.

It is only credible, in case the author had been surprised by death, before he had affixed the conclusion, that another hand had added the rest. But then some difference in the language must have been manifested in the addition, as in the seventh book

[t] Griesbach, Commentarius Crit. in text. Græc. N. T. Particula, ii. p. 199.

of Thucydides, where on account of the deterioration of the language, it is supposed that his daughter added it after the death of her father.

If we would object to this, that the continuation of Mark is too short for us to judge of the style of writing, we well know that even in a short space, a different tone and the peculiarities of expression are discoverable[g]. As to that, which farther concerns his death, history says that Mark, after the composition of the Gospel, quitted Rome, repaired to Egypt, and taught at Alexandria[h]. We should therefore, without the support of external or internal reasons, decide upon the death of the author, which alone could justify us in the assertion, that the end of the book proceeded from another hand.

If we also consider the other case, that he was interrupted by the decease of his Voucher, it is self-evident, how there could exist in the most antient times copies with and without a conclusion. The friends of the history of Jesus took or procured for themselves copies of that which existed: the more so, as the work was very nearly completed. When after some time the conclusion appeared, it was added to some MSS., and in others it was neglected: thus it happened that some books continued without

[g] We have also a proof in the conclusion, *παντα δε τα παρηγγελμενα.* λ. which was added to some MSS. as we have shewn. Therein the expression *συντομως* is almost foreign to the New Testament. Instead of *ἱερον, ἁγιον* is the usual Scriptural expression, and *ἀφθαρτον* joined with *κηρυγμα*, is taken from the oratorical style of the Fathers of the Church. In four lines such a deviation from the Diction of the New Testament is manifested.

[h] Euseb. H. E. L. ii. c. 16. Epiphan. Hæres. Li. § 6. Hieronym. Catal. v. Marcus. Gelas decret. de script. Apocryph. Mansi Collect. Concil. T. viii. p. 147. Eutych. Alexandrin. annal. T. 1. p. 334. and 37. text Arab.

a conclusion, after complete copies were long in existence.

The death of the two Apostles, with whom Mark was at Rome, might easily have had such an effect upon the Believers in the Capital, as to have caused interruptions in the assemblies and in the occupations of Mark, probably also to have caused his sudden departure, as we may readily imagine. It appears to me, in favor of the other case, that we should not have received this compressed account of the history of the resurrection, composed in such few words, but rather a more extensive transmission of the accounts respecting this distinguished event of Christianity, if the witness, whose declaration Mark has mentioned in his work, had spoken about it.

But, on the other hand, let us consider the author who, in other cases, places his merit in delineating facts according to their circumstances, as cautiously contenting himself with the general outlines of the last event, as if he would allow to himself no latitude, where he is destitute of the authority and testimony of the eye-witness. All is nearly so, as it must have been under the circumstances, which we have imagined.

Others recede from this proposition, and require that the genuine conclusion of Mark is lost, *as heretofore*, and then they declare, from the fact which they have themselves assumed, that the present conclusion is not genuine. By the dissentient formulary, *as heretofore*, they emancipate themselves from the production of any proof, and even from the explanation, how the loss of the genuine conclusion can be conceived possible. If in Luke a part of the history was lost from the middle of the book without being noticed, we can show that it escaped observation by means of a ὁμοιοτελευτον. The same should also be shown

here; but, how could the end of a book disappear unnoticed? At all events it must be extraordinary: if it happened before copies were taken, before the publication of the Gospel, Mark could easily have remedied it, and ought to have remedied it: if it happened after copies were taken, the genuine conclusion would at least have been preserved in some copies: and what could it then be BUT THAT WHICH HAS BEEN PRESERVED?

SECTION LXX.

JOHN, Chap. xxi. 1. to the end.

THE end of John's Gospel is expected, at the 30th and 31st verses of the xxth chapter; and it is embarrassing, after the Disciple takes, as it were, the last glance at his work, and apologizes for its imperfection, on account of the object which he had in view, which only permitted him to compile the events which announce Jesus to have been the Son of God, the Christ, and the Author of Life, that after this final explanation of his conduct, he should quite abruptly commence a new narrative.

This created suspicion against the passage, which is so totally separated from the connection of the rest of the history, for which scholars soon suggested ulterior reasons[i], but no one has so energetically attacked it, as a celebrated Biblical critic of our days[k]. He declared it to be an addition from

[i] Grotius Adnot. ad Johan. xx. 30. Ger. Joh. Vossius Harm. Evangel. L. iii. cap. 4. § 8. Jo. Clericus Biblioth. Universel. t. ii. p. 473.

[k] Eberh. Gottl. Paulus in the New Repertory for Biblical and Oriental Literature, Part II.

another hand, and explained the cause of it in the following manner: —

The report had gone abroad, that John should, whilst still alive on the earth, witness, according to the express promise of Jesus, the last advent of the Lord, John xxi. 22, 23. Now John had died, and the Lord as yet had not come. From this circumstance prejudicial conjectures arose respecting the delay of the advent of Jesus, and respecting the truth of Christianity itself. To prevent which, some well-intentioned person made the supplement to this Gospel, and showed from the speech of Jesus, that its contents were incorrectly interpreted, if they were imagined to signify, that the advent of the Lord was promised, while John was yet alive.

He shows the difference of the style of writing to be the first argument, that the supplement is by another hand. John, who is always accustomed to speak of himself in the third person, here speaks in the first person singular, and in the Attic dialect besides, οἶμαι xxi. 25., as well as in the first person plural xxi. 24, οἴδαμεν ὅτι κ. τ. λ.

But how often does he speak in the same manner in the cotemporary Epistles? does he not say: γραφω, ἐγραψα, ἀκηκοαμεν, ἑωρακαμεν? 1 Ep. ii. 13, 14. i. 1, 2, 3. Does he not also say at the beginning of the Gospel, ἐθεασαμεθα την δοξαν αὐτου, i. 14. and if he has never before used Attic forms, what are ἀκηκοαμεν and ἑωρακαμεν? John iii. 11. iv. 42. xiv. 9.

But erroneous reports are also said to have crept in from the tradition, which cannot proceed from John, and cannot be expected from him. The disciples are represented, as living in Galilee between the resurrection and the ascension of Jesus, which

is not correct, for eight days after the resurrection they continued at Jerusalem, John xx. 26.

But after they had made their observations and inquiries on the scene of the death and resurrection, they could have gone within the following thirty-two days to Galilee, whither they were directed, not only by the account of the women, but by Jesus himself, after the resurrection should have taken place, Matt. xxvi. 32. Mark xiv. 28.

But they received (it is replied) the command, on the very day of the resurrection, not to leave Jerusalem, Luke xxiv. 49. How could they then be in Galilee?

It is not so: the Acts of the Apostles give to us a nearer definition of the time: the Lord had already lived forty days among his disciples, when he admonished them not to quit Jerusalem, until they οὐ μετα πολλας ταυτας ἡμερας, in a few days should have received the Holy Ghost, Acts i. 3, 4, 5. Not even in the Gospel of Luke does this idea find a plea, that they had received the command immediately after the resurrection; but on the contrary here, as well as in the Acts of the Apostles, it was the last injunction of the Lord, after which he departed from them, and ascended into Heaven. There remain, therefore, more than thirty days for the scenes in Galilee.

Is there any thing incredible in the idea, that John should have himself opposed an error, which existed during his lifetime with regard to himself, the consequences of which were perceived by him? Why should he consign to another hand what he could do best himself, and which was a part of his vocation?

Let us examine the narrative. As it is composed, it cannot have been first committed to writing

after the death of John. It is animated by a circumstantiality, which we can only claim from an eye-witness, who noted each circumstance with much sympathy, and preserved each deeply in his memory. He not only remembers for many years after the event all the persons, who were present, but many accessory facts, which one would far less expect. He still knows exactly, how and with what Peter dressed himself in a hurry, to hasten towards the Lord. With the most practised ocular mensuration of a fisherman he still knows the distance of the ship from the land: *It was not far, about two hundred yards from the shore.* He still knows the number of the fishes which they caught, not merely at a computation, but so, that not one of the number escapes him: *There were of them an hundred and fifty-three,* and is still surprised, how it happened, that the net did not break.

Who then could know, after a series of years, all the minutiæ, unless he had caught and divided them with the rest? Is not the participating spectator every where manifest? is not even the fisherman every where manifest? How could any one then after John's death write such a detail? Was he not a young man among the disciples of Jesus? and did he not die, as the πρεσβυτερος, AS THE ELDER?

He, however, himself perceived, that after the conclusion of his work, the addition of such a supplement might be assailed by suspicions, hence he expressly added? "*It is the disciple* (who lay in the bosom of Jesus, to whom he spoke this) *who testifies and has written this.*" So great was the precaution which he used!

If then, it be not his style of writing, if the narrative be interwoven with false traditions, and never-

theless added to the book bearing his name and subscription, we have in this case a falsity, and the integrity of the well meaning individual, who presumed to do this, is not very great.

But, with what strict truth is the narrative contrived? is such a narrative the production of an impostor, or mere gossip compiled from all sorts of reports? How psychologically does he identify himself in the representations, which principally refer to fishermen? How strikingly has he shown the conduct of Peter from his general disposition? He scarcely hears, that it is the Lord, than he throws himself hastily into the sea, that he might reach him quickly, in exact unison with the impetuosity of his soul and of his other actions. The other disciples act differently; they know that it is the Lord, but they have not presence of mind to address him.

Jesus now asks Peter thrice, *Lovest thou me?* A mild reproof for what he had done, in having thrice denied him. How suitable, and how distinct from passion and human feelings!

Quite opposite was the conduct of the Apostle; he does not preserve his equanimity on the third repetition, his character becomes again impetuous. Yet he does not become irritated: how could he at this moment? the effect on this occasion was necessarily different—he is wounded.

Jesus pacifies the impetuous man with his whole confidence; but shows him at the same time the prospect of a suffering end. The Apostle understands it, but does not shrink from it, he does not stand confounded on the spot, nor lost in thoughts about himself. This would be untrue with regard to thousands, but not with regard to him. The first impression must have so operated upon him, as it

operated formerly, Luke xxii. 38. and still more forcibly now.

What is now more natural than the peculiar turn which his mind takes; what should become of him, who was his rival in the heart of the Lord? And what is more suitable than the answer: What is it to thee, if I have destined for him a milder fate?

All this then has too much character and internal truth, too much adaptation to the persons and their situations, for it to be considered as a compilation of different traditions, or the invention of a pious fraud.

Or, if we assume the two last verses (*It is the disciple, who testifies and writes this, and we are sure that his testimony is true. There is also still much more respecting Jesus,* etc. [1]) because they are spoken by way of communication, and because the last words contain an hyperbole, not to have been

[1] Hug has borrowed nearly the whole contents of this section from Kuinoel *in loco*, in whom the conflicting opinons and the state of the controversy are more fully shown. In him the modern authors, who have treated of the subject, will be found, to recapitulate whose positions, it will be unnecessary after this reference. The arguments respecting the dialect in this chapter are indeed absurd:— from the recurrence of it in the first Epistle of John, and from the continual use of οἰδαμεν in it, it is more than presumptive, that the two last verses of the Gospel were also written by himself: according to the *norma loquendi* of the age, it is equivalent to και οἰδα, ὁτι ἀληθης ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρια μου, from the common custom of the speaker making a transition from the first to the third person. Photius has preserved an extract from the writings of Ephræm, Patriarch of Theopolis, (Bibl. p. 197.) which corroborates Hug's statement of the traditions current respecting the Apostle: ὁτι δε περιεστιν ὁ παρθενος Ἰωαννης, ὁνπερ ἐζητησας, ὡσπερ τον Ἐνωχ και τον Ἠλιαν, παραδωσις μαρτυρει, οὐτω και τουτον. The Paschal Chronicle (p. 252.) however says, that he lived μετα την ἀναληψιν του Κυριου και Θεου ἡμων ἐτη οβ'.—*Translator.*

written by John: but as Dr. Less will have it, to have been added by the Church at Ephesus to authenticate the supplement; we have again, in this case, the authority of his cotemporaries, and of a considerable community, recognizing him as the author of the section.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

SECTION LXXI.

THE Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel of Luke constitute a whole, of which the latter is the first, and the former the last part. In the Gospel he presents to us the history of Jesus, until his ascension; in the Acts he again resumes the thread of the narrative, where he had dropped it in the first history. If we connect the beginning of the Acts with the end of the Gospel, we evidently perceive, that in the latter he postpones the circumstantial treatment of the ascension to preserve it for the following work, and that he had already resolved upon the plan of its continuation in the Acts of the Apostles, when he was finishing the Gospel.

Thus, has Luke himself considered the two writings:—he calls the Gospel in Acts i. 1. πρωτον λογον, *the first account*, the first part, which was to acquaint us with the actions and doctrines of Jesus, ὠν ἠρξατο ποιειν τε και διδασκειν, which can only be called the first part in contradistinction to a second. The Acts of the Apostles is then the δευτερος λογος, which is intended to instruct us respecting the results and effects of the undertakings of this teacher, after his death, respecting the actions of his disciples, the progress and increase of his school.

SECTION LXXII.

THE contents are these. After the Lord had given his last commands, he ascends to heaven. The Apostles fill up the place of Judas—ii. At the Pentecost occur the communication of the Spirit,—its operations,—the false opinion respecting them,—Peter's refutation of it in a discourse to the people,—its impression upon the auditors. The increasing respect for the Apostles;—the state of the community in Jerusalem—iii. Peter and John cure in the Temple, one who was born lame;—the consequent astonishment of the people. Peter declares Jesus to be the author of the miracle. The chief of the Temple hastens thither, sees the commotion, hears the orator, takes him prisoner along with his companion—iv. On the following day the Sanhedrim assemble:—the two Apostles are brought before them. Peter boldly defends himself. They liberate him and John under the injunction to preach Jesus no more. They return to their friends and meet with an enthusiastic reception—iv. 2. The intercommunity of Christian property; the hypocritical fraud of Ananias and his wife—v. 14. Wonderful cures are effected by the Apostles;—the Sanhedrim are perplexed on account of them; they put the Apostles in prison. An Angel liberates them;—they preach publicly in the Temple;—they are again apprehended;—and brought before the Sanhedrim. They defend themselves;—Gamaliel pleads,—in consequence of whose speech they are liberated with a punishment;—but they continue to teach in the Temple—vi. The Hellenists complain on account of no provision being made for their widows;—Deacons are chosen for this pur-

pose;—Stephen is one of them. His zeal for conversion, and his violent death—viii. Philip teaches in Samaria;—many become believers;—among them Simon, who offers money for the gifts of the Spirit. On the road to Gaza Philip meets the treasurer of Candace;—instructs him respecting the Messiah and baptizes him—ix. Saul persecutes the believers in Jesus;—in the act of so doing is converted, and then preaches Jesus at Damascus:—is on that account obliged to flee;—goes to Jerusalem and then to Tarsus—ix. 31. Peter visits the believers at Lydda;—cures Æneas;—visits Joppa;—raises Tabitha;—baptizes Cornelius at Cæsarea;—defends himself before the congregation at Jerusalem, on account of the baptism of this heathen, xi. 19.

In the mean time the Church at Antioch is established. Barnabas is sent thither from Jerusalem,—seeks Saul,—they exercise together the office of the ministry—xi. 26. Agabus presages a famine at Antioch;—Saul and Barnabas are on that account sent to the holy city. Agrippa there puts to death James the elder;—puts Peter into prison, who is miraculously liberated and escapes. Agrippa dies—xii. 25. Now Saul and Barnabas are sent from Antioch to preach the Gospel in foreign lands. They go to Cyprus, from thence on the continent to Asia Minor. Their actions in Antioch της Πισιδιας;—in Iconium;—in Lystra;—their return home and the account of their actions—xv. 1. Commotions in the Antiochian Church on account of the obligations of the Jewish observances on the heathens. Paul and Barnabas go a second time as messengers to the holy city. A solemn council in Jerusalem and a decision of the disputed question. A similar mission accompanies Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, xv. 36.

They resolve on a new journey to Asia Minor; they separate; Paul goes with Silas. At Lystra they receive Timotheus for a companion;—they travel through Phrygia, Galatia;—they embark for Europe, xvi. 10.

Luke associates himself with them from Troas to Philippi, their fate there. They travel through Macedonia to Athens and Corinth, xvii. 2. Paul teaches at Corinth;—is banished;—goes by way of Ephesus to Jerusalem;—from thence returns to Ephesus, where he teaches, until he is also banished thence, xx. 1. He directs his course again towards Macedonia and Achaia; repairs once more with Luke to Jerusalem;—is apprehended. Paul's defence before the people;—before the Sanhedrim—before Felix—before Festus—before Agrippa the younger;—his embarkation for Rome;—occurrences on his voyage and arrival at Rome.

The whole is divided into THREE SECTIONS. The foundation of Christianity in Palestine; the origin of the Church at Antioch, and the expeditions from thence into the heathen countries of Asia. Finally, the expeditions to Europe, where Luke accompanies Paul. This last division we might again divide into two parts;—the actions of Paul, after the historian had become more intimately connected with him, xvi. 10., and after Luke had become his inseparable companion, xx. 6. *to the end.*

SECTION LXXIII.

OF one part of the events the author does not merely declare himself as an eye-witness, but includes himself as a participant in the narrative: yet we only find this in the more advanced periods of

the history, Acts xv. 10. and xx. 6. But he might also have seen still a great part of the events which he describes in the *first section* of the book; unless, indeed, he had left Palestine where he had resided during the actions of Jesus, immediately after his death. In the same manner, as it would be precipitate and arbitrary to extend to all the occurrences in Palestine the declaration, which he has laid down in the Proemium of the Gospel, without recollecting that this declaration in reality regards the contents of the Gospel only; so would it not be less arbitrary for us not to admit his residence in this country, an hour longer, than the period commemorated in the Gospel requires. The Proemium assures us of Luke's abode in Palestine during the time which he has mentioned, but, by no means excludes a prolongation of his presence there.

This being presupposed, we must certify ourselves from the construction of the Acts of the Apostles how long we may and must consider him to have been present in Palestine. If we consider the uncommon knowledge which the author displays in the section relative to the events in Palestine, it is very credible that he had not yet left this theatre. This perfect acquaintance with facts continues, without diminution, until the second section, *i. e.* until the establishment of the Church at Antioch, Acts xi. 19. From this moment he turns away from Palestine, and only speaks of the chiefs and of the occurrences in the parent-school of Christianity, when deputies from Antioch make their appearance in Jerusalem, and only as long as they are present there, Acts xii. 1—25. and xv. 4—30.

This quickly ceasing attention to Palestine, may have either originated in a sudden inactivity of the deacons

and preachers of that school, consequently in the want of events worthy of remark: or it is to be ascribed to the different point of view, which the historian had taken. In proportion as the first hypothesis is the less credible, so much the more certainty is attached to the second, that Luke had left Palestine, when Christianity began to flourish at Antioch. But after some time he also forgets the Church at Antioch. The cause of this change is manifested in the course of the narrative itself. For Luke went to Alexandria-Troas. Acts xvi. 8—10., where he became a stranger to the fortunes of the Church at Antioch. On the other hand he was indebted to this new residence for having become an eye-witness to Paul's reception in Europe and to his first actions in this part of the earth, also for having become his travelling companion; for having thus acquired his increased confidence, and thus becoming capacitated to become the Apostle's historian in the last epoch, in which the scenes of his undertakings and adventures were more and more remote.

We plainly see what influence each station of Luke had upon his historical book, which we intend still farther to elucidate, by a farther consideration of the three historical sections. In the third section, Luke is copious and explicit as long as he is at Paul's side, or even only near to him, Acts xvi. 10. —xviii. The farther the Apostle is separated from him, the shorter becomes the narrative. The occurrences of one year and a half at Corinth he comprises in seventeen verses, Acts xviii. 1—17. We are almost exclusively apprised of the arrival and departure of Paul without being informed of the importance of the result, and of the state of the community. Immediately after he comprehends in two verses a journey from Ephesus to Jerusalem,

from thence to Antioch, and from thence back to Ephesus by way of Galatia and Phrygia, Acts xviii. 22—28. But when the Apostle rejoins Luke, xx. 6. the narrative is re-animated, becomes copious and energetic by means of an agreeable circumstantiality.

In the second section, which is devoted to the occurrences at Antioch, he only is acquainted with the origin of the church, the first scenes there and the journey undertaken by Paul and Barnabas from Antioch to Cyprus and Asia Minor, xv. 1. But then he is deficient in materials until the second mission to Jerusalem, after which the Apostle abandoned Antioch as his station, and a few years afterwards Luke enters into a nearer connection with Paul. As far as concerns the journey to Cyprus, the actions of the Apostles at the court of the Pro-Consul, their departure, the sermon in Antioch of Pisidia, their fate at Iconium, Lystra, and other places, Acts xiii. 1.—xiv. 27, the chief incidents are well developed, and have a particular finish in the representation; whereas things which do not exceed the limits of common occurrences, are hastily noticed, and the members of the narrative are so constituted, as probably the two Teachers may have stated to the church of Antioch respecting their travels.

We next arrive at an epoch void of events relating to Palestine and Antioch, which in Luke is called in general terms, χρονος οὐκ ὀλιγος, *no inconsiderable time*, Acts xiv. 28. which actually comprizes several years. On a correct estimate, the transactions of the first expedition into the heathen countries may assuredly have occupied two years; nevertheless full five years, until the twelfth year of Claudius, are passed over, as though no Antioch had existed, and no Paul had lived. Not before the twelfth year of

this emperor, as we shall see farther in the sequel from chronological data, the history again revives with the remarkable dissensions about the obligation of the Mosaic ordinances, Acts xv. 1. But in the succeeding year Luke was in the company of Paul, whence he was able to obtain an extensive knowledge of these very recent facts, xvi. 10. But the five preceding years however, on that account, did not remain the less undescribed. Respecting these, he has not collected any accounts whilst in the company of Paul; much less still did he live during this time in those parts which still continued to be the proper field of Christian history. Who would imagine that during so long a time nothing worthy of remark had taken place in Palestine and Syria, or that nothing was done by Paul, because his journey was devoid of incidents? If Luke had already gone to Troas, where Paul afterwards met him; or if he was somewhere else; he could, least of all, have been only in Antioch or Palestine. Nothing of the sort, besides, happened to the historian in the whole book:—in the third section the succession of time is consecutively maintained, even if the dates be not always copiously furnished.

The first section, compared with these two, has a fulness, of which no other can boast. Wherever the historian appears circumstantial and minutely informed in affairs and discourses, it is in the events of Palestine; whereas, those narratives only of the third section, where he was himself present at the transactions, have received that completion, which, in the first, they all alike possess. If ever, therefore, we have reason to recognize him as a spectator, it is here. A comparison with his most vigorous narratives, which he wrote from personal

knowledge, substantiates this conclusion throughout the whole of the first section.

SECTION LXXIV.

From these observations, the author's plan becomes easily intelligible. It was not his greatest object to memorialize what share each Apostle had taken in the promulgation of the faith, what churches he had founded, and what was his fate. If we ascribe to it such an object, the first section of his work would be but imperfect. Nor was it likewise his object, to treat fully in a second part of the history of Paul up to a certain time; for he was not possessed of all the requisite facts, as we perceive from the Acts of the Apostles themselves, and as we may farther be convinced from the eleventh chapter of the second Epistle to the Corinthians. He had not either of these plans in his mind, and collected his materials accordingly. It would have been too late to have begun to compile matter for a second part, if he only contemplated it (§ 71.) after having completed the Gospel. It was not a plan which he previously conceived, and hoped to execute by means of inquiries; but it was the abundance of recollections and annotations which he had already in store which induced him to undertake the Acts of the Apostles. Regardless of perfection, and without unity of idea he therefore detailed, at one time, remarkable incidents, at another more extensive portions of history as he had noted them down on the different stations, to which he was led by his circumstances of life. Through this fortunate change of locality, in which he at different times found

himself, he nevertheless was enabled, in a general description, to furnish his readers with an idea, how Christianity, after the death of its Founder, was preserved, established, and, in a short time, communicated to many nations.

SECTION LXXV.

The years in which he composed his work, and the man, for whom he wrote it, had a great influence on its actual condition. The Gospel of Luke, the third in order of time, appeared immediately after the death of Paul, much more therefore the Acts of the Apostles: for that of Mark, although it preceded the Gospel of Luke, was not published till after the death of Peter and Paul. (Sect. 16.) But, if chasms are discovered in the succession of facts mentioned by this Apostle, it was impossible to receive from himself any farther disclosures and supplies; if the theatre of these facts lay in remote countries, it was a very tedious task to make the necessary inquiries concerning them. Luke was consequently obliged, on this account, to renounce perfection, however anxious he may have been to attain it.

We must however particularly consider one circumstance, which is decisive as to the scope of this work. He dedicated it like the Gospel to his patron Theophilus, and principally designed it for his instruction, Acts i. 1. That he might be understood by him, Luke in many places has added elucidations, mostly of a geographical nature, until Paul reaches Italy. At this period he ceases to intersperse remarks of this description, being perfectly

convinced, that Theophilus was henceforward acquainted with the situation of the places. (Section 34.) Similar to which, is his conduct respecting the facts themselves. Luke, with great circumstantiality, treats of the earlier deeds of the Apostle, as well as of those subsequently at Jerusalem and afterwards, until he arrives at Rome; but scarcely is he arrived at Rome, ere he concludes his narrative with the remark, that Paul passed full two years in this place, without adding another word.

Yet, as we see from the Epistles of the Apostle, which were written from thence, Luke was continually with him, was able to have been a cospectator of every thing, and must have participated with him in many sufferings. And, indeed, these scenes in the capital of the world, were particularly worthy of notice in the Christian history, and were perhaps the most peaceful in the life of the Apostle. The charges of his accusers, his trials, his defence, which, as the Apostle himself says, made his *fetters in the Prætorium honorable, and glorious to Christianity; the new increase of converts which he gained to it;* the endeavours of his enemies and friends for his destruction and preservation, were of great importance to his cotemporaries and to the future worshippers of Jesus. Upon all this he does not dwell in a single word; he does not even mention the judicial sentence which decided the Apostle's affair, nor any cause of his enlargement.

Luke was not then concerned about his cotemporaries, who in remote countries of Asia had great difficulty in obtaining circumstantial and authenticated accounts of these events. As little was he concerned about posterity; the friendship for the man, whose pious thirst after knowledge he wished

to satisfy, removed both these considerations from his eyes. He was the object; others were only casual participators. The point of view in which Luke thought of him, was consequently the limit, and the author had no occasion to go farther than to conduct him to the point, from which his own knowledge began.

As we therefore on the one hand are indebted to the friendship for Theophilus for the resolution of the author to disengage the history of Jesus from the interpolations of unauthenticated historians, by means of his Gospel, to separate from thence that which was substantiated, and to deposit it in a faithful historical work,—so can we only impute it to the relative circumstances in which his friend stood to the facts in the Acts of the Apostles, that no historical information respecting the scenes at Rome was imparted to his cotemporaries and future ages.

SECTION LXXVI.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

Much depends on the chronology of this treatise with regard to the explanation of the Acts of the Apostles, and still more with regard to the elucidation of Paul's Epistles. I have great reason here to rectify some oversights, which I have made in [m] the former edition.

[m] In composing this sketch among the more modern writings I had consulted Vogel (Essay on the Chronological Stations in the Biography of Paul;) in Gabler's Journal for select Theolog. Literat. vol. i. part 1. A new essay on the chronological stations in the Acts of the Apostles, etc., by Dr. Süskind, in Bengel's Archives of Theology, and its most modern literature, vol. i. n. 12. and vol. ii.

There is a passage which determines the chronology in a manner that few do, in Acts xi. 28.—xii. 25. Agabus had prophesied, at Antioch, an impending famine; on which account the believers made a collection for the support of the needy in Judæa, and sent Barnabas and Paul with it to Jerusalem. After Luke has mentioned the mission of the two teachers, Acts xi. 30., he passes to the remarkable occurrences which at that time took place in the holy city, xii. 1., the apprehension of Peter occasioned by the satisfaction of the people at the execution of James; then Peter's miraculous escape and removal from Jerusalem; and the counterpart of it in the death of Herod Agrippa. After this the deputies, as Luke says, returned to Antioch, Acts xii. 25. The chronological coincidence of these events with the residence of the two delegates at Jerusalem, rests, according to the representation of the historian, not merely on the determination of the time κατ' ἐκεινον τον καιρον, xi. 1., but also on the farther disposition of the narrative, by means of which he includes these incidents in the residence of Barnabas and Paul, and only fixes their return home to Antioch after the conclusion of them.

Consequently the death of Agrippa would also be included in this period which followed soon after the circumstances just mentioned. Immediately after the feast at which Peter's execution was to have

part ii. *Kuinoel, (Commentarius in libros Nov. Test. historicos.* vol. iv. *Prolegomen. in Act. Apost.*) Bertholdt. Histor. Crit. Introduct. to the writings of the Old and New Testament, part v. No. 2. § 629. The extent to which I limited my work did not permit me to meet individually and explicitly all the objections in which I differ from these learned men, though in the development of my proofs I have carefully attended to them.

taken place, the king left Jerusalem[n], his usual residence, and went to Cæsarea, the place of his death according to Luke, and according to Josephus, Acts xii. 9. Jos. Ant. L. xix. c. 8. n. 4. The departure for that place happened immediately on Peter's delivery. Since then the delegates were not pressed for time, the final fate of the king might have easily been decided, whilst they were yet in the holy city. As they had no message to bring back, in reply, which demanded expedition, and as there was no more occasion for them at Antioch as we see soon after their return, Acts xiii. 1, 2., they had no inducement to hasten their return home.

However, even admitting the death of Agrippa to have been retarded yet for some months after his arrival at Cæsarea, and to have been related instantly rather for the sake of completion, than because it took place at the time, during which the two teachers were at Jerusalem; even admitting this, it would still be during the year in which Agrippa died, in which the events recorded are placed.

This year we find then exactly cited by Josephus; "Agrippa died after he had reigned four years under Caius, and three years under Claudius Cæsar." He remarks for a still more complete determination of the time, that "the third year under Claudius had already expired," τριτον ἐτος ἠδη πεπληρωτο[o].

[n] Jos. Ant. L. xix. cap. 7. n. 3. ἠδεια γουν αὐτῳ διαιτα και συνεχης ἐν τοις Ἱεροσολυμοις ἠν.

[o] In the book on the Jewish war, ii. c. 11. n. 6. he twice only gives a round number, three; for Caius Cæsar has not completed the fourth year. But Antiq. L. xix. c. 8. n. 2. he has described the time with all the above quoted definitions: τετταρας μεν οὐν ἐπι Γαΐου Καισαρος ἐβασιλευσεν ἐνιαυτους'—τρεις δε ἐπιλαβων ἐπι Κλαυδιου Καισαρος Αὐτοκρατοριας. κ.τ.λ.

The deputies of the people of Antioch (that we may take them also into consideration) arrived at Jerusalem at the feast of the Passover; for the apprehension of Peter took place at the time of the unleavened bread, Acts xiii. 3., and the execution was to take place after the feast, xii. 4., thus Agrippa's death did not occur until after the passover.

Now Claudius assumed the empire of the world, in the month of January, and his third year was already completed, when Agrippa died. This passover therefore cannot be the passover of the third year of Claudius; but it coincides with the beginning of his fourth year. By this the period is most perfectly determined; in the third month of the fourth year of the reign of Claudius, Barnabas and Paul had arrived at Jerusalem with the contributions of the people of Antioch; some time afterwards Agrippa died.

After Agrippa's death, the famine foretold by Agabus, came to pass; viz. under Cuspius Fadus, who, on account of the minority of Agrippa the younger, was placed by Rome over the management of his paternal dominions, and under Tiberius Alexander, who succeeded him in this office [p].

This being premised, we must once more return to the mission of Barnabas and Paul. Some imagined that they discovered allusion to it in the Epistle to the Galatians. ii. 1—15, and thence drew conclusions as to the chronology, because the Apostle begins to speak of it with the words, *within fourteen years came I again to Jerusalem.* The date is of importance, on which account it is incumbent on us to know, to what fact the words cited refer.

[p] Jos. Ant. L. xx. c. 5. n. 2. compared with c. 2. n. 6. and Ant. L. III. c. 15. n. 3.

I was of opinion, in which I had illustrious predecessors, that Paul spoke of the mission about the impending famine; but this mission cannot be intended; it must be a later one which he again undertook with Barnabas on another occasion, Acts xv. 1—4. My reasons are the following: It was not yet so long, since Paul had attained such estimation in the Christian community, Acts xi. 25. cf. Galat. i. 21—25. and at the time when he was sent by the Church at Antioch to be the bearer of their charitable contributions, he was only a local teacher and assistant to Barnabas at Antioch, Acts xi. 22. 26. His call to the apostolical office was only acknowledged after his return from this mission, Acts xiii. 2.

But in the Epistle to the Galatians, he already appears as a distinguished Apostle, corroborated in his claims by his actions. He had already been an Apostle among the Gentiles, Galat. ii. 2., and the proofs were indubitable, that the instruction of the Gentiles, ἀκροβυστιας εὐαγγελιον and ἀποστολη, was confided to him, so that he, as teacher of the heathens, ranked with Peter, the teacher of the Jews, Gal. ii. 7, 8. the appointment to this office, also, which he had received from a higher power, χαρις δοθεισα, was so authenticated, that James, Peter, and John entered into a division with him, by virtue of which they reserved Judæa to themselves, but assigned to him the wide world, Gal. ii. 9.

Such a thing could only have taken place, when Paul had returned from his great journey among the Heathens, Acts xiii. 2.—xv. and was sent, the second time, with Barnabas, from Antioch to Jerusalem, to desire a decision of the polemical question respecting the obligation of the Jewish observances, Acts xv. 1—30. This mission alone can be intended:

it took place, as he says, within fourteen years, since which he had, three years after his conversion, presented himself as a Christian and fellow believer to the Apostles and to the community at Jerusalem, Gal. i. 18. to ii. 1. The intermediate journey to Jerusalem with the charitable contributions of the people of Antioch, Paul has consequently passed over in silence in the Epistle to the Galatians, because he did not intend to sketch his biography, but to show, in this composition from facts, that he had not received his illumination from the Apostles; that he was not inferior to them in authority and Apostolic power, and that he stood in a rank and dignity equal to them according to their own confession. If then this intermediate journey had furnished him with nothing useful to his purpose, it was superfluous to mention it.

The fourteen years mentioned end with the mission respecting the Jewish observances, and begin from his first appearance as a Christian in Jerusalem. In what year, now, does this scene fall? Let us consult the circumstances under which it took place, and see how much assistance we shall thence derive for the discovery of the year. At that time he came from Damascus, Gal. i. 17, 18, where he was obliged to flee, because he had irritated the Jews by his discourses, and with great difficulty escaped over the wall in a basket, because the Jews sought after his life, and watched the gates, Acts ix. 22. 29. Of this circumstance Paul again makes mention in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, xi. 32, 33, where we see that the governor of the city, whom Aretas the king had in Damascus ὁ ἐν Δαμασκῳ ἐθναρχης watched the city in person, or caused it to be watched, and authorized the Jews to this violence, and supported

them in its execution. When did Aretas obtain the government of Damascus?

Not long before Pompey, on his return from the Mithridatic war, came into these parts, the people of Damascus, for the sake of ridding themselves of a hated prince, called Aretas, King of Arabia Petræa, to the sovereignty of Cœle-Syria[r]. Scarcely had Pompey approached, ere he intermeddled in these affairs according to the custom of the Romans, caused Damascus to be taken by his generals[s], and Aretas to be sought in the interior of his dominions by the Roman arms. But the Romans had a difficult task in these defiles and deserts; and he, on his part, did his utmost to endanger them; consequently a peace was made[t]. Damascus remained henceforward under the protection of the Romans. We see from this period its coins stamped with the head of Augustus and Tiberius[u]. Not long before the death of Tiberius, it was involved in a dispute with Sidon respecting the boundaries; both cities contended for their rights before a Roman plenipotentiary in Syria[x]. Still it remained free under the Roman protection.

About this time we again meet with an Aretas, king of Petræa, who at first was at variance with the Romans, in consequence of which, Augustus for a long time refused to recognize him as king[y]. Herod Antipas carried on an unsuccessful war against him, and afterwards solicited assistance from the Romans[z].

[r] Jos. Ant. L. xiii. c. 15. n. 2.

[s] Ant. L. xiv. c. 2. n. 3.

[t] Ant. L. xiv. c. 5.

[u] Eckhel, Doctr. num. vet. P. 1. vol. iii. p. 330, 331. The inscriptions are all Greek.

[x] Jos. Ant. L. xviii. c. 6. n. 3.

[y] Ant. L. xvi. c. 9. n. 4.

[z] Ant. L. xviii. c. 5. n. 1. and 3.

Vitellius received the commission to wage war upon Aretas. But whilst he was marching towards him, he received the account of Tiberius's death. Instantly Vitellius retraced his steps, under the plea that his authority had ceased [a]. The victory over Herod; the return of Vitellius; the change of the Roman emperor and the warlike preparations which had already been made, seem to have encouraged the Arabian to reconquer Damascus, which had been torn from his ancestors. The *raison de guerre*, as it is commonly called, rendered it expedient to deprive the Romans of a city which served them as a depôt, and which now served [b] Aretas as the protection of his states.

A festival, probably the Passover, was at hand, when Vitellius retired with his legions [c], for Tiberius died on the 16th of March, of which Vitellius was informed in less than three weeks, and dismissed the army in the station, which it had occupied during the winter. Now, the time had arrived for the Arabian to invest Damascus and to open the siege. If it be objected, that Vitellius would not have suffered such a thing, I am of opinion that he was

[a] Ant. xviii. c. 5. n. 4.

[b] Some etymologists have absurdly and fancifully deduced this name from the Greek. The Arabic version writes it اراطا probably not quite correctly; yet that the name was of common occurrence among the Arabs, and perhaps an official title, successively bestowed on the different monarchs of these parts, and not written with any considerable variation from that in the Arabic version, we are assured by the cities which bore a name derived from hence, such a ذواراط—ارطة—اراطي &c., and from the wells and springs, which have an equally evident derivation. We should suppose the name to have been written اراط without the final *elif* of the Arabian translator.—*Translator.*

[c] Ant. L. xviii. c. 5. n. 3.

indeed obliged to suffer it: if his authority was at an end, as he himself declared, with respect to a war already proclaimed, much more was it at an end with regard to a new one.

However, the dominion of the Nabathæan king and his deputies at Damascus did not last long. Before the expiration of the second year of his reign, Caius Cæsar disposed the affairs of Asia: he gave a king to the Ituræan Arabs, who bordered upon the Nabathæan, and upon one side also, upon the dominions of Damascus, and frequently harassed it by surprises; he likewise severed some other parts from Arabia [d]. Amidst such arrangements, Damascus, a powerful Roman garrison-city, could not be overlooked. Consequently, the Arab possessed it, at the most, only from the middle of the first, till nearly the end of the second year of Caius Cæsar. If we place the jeopardy and flight of Paul in the middle of this period, they fall in the beginning of the second year of Caius's government of the world. If we commence at this time, THE FOURTEEN YEARS reach to Paul's second mission to Jerusalem respecting the obligation of the Jewish observances, and coincide with THE TWELFTH YEAR OF CLAUDIUS.

But, it is the flight from Damascus to Jerusalem, to which Paul commencing from his conversion counts THREE YEARS, Gal. i. 15—18 [e]. These three years are cotemporary with the first of Caius and the two last

[d] Dio. Cass. L. LIX. p. 649. ἐν δε τουτῳ Σοαιμῳ μεν την των Ἰτουραιων των Ἀραβων, Κοτυϊ δε την Ἀρμηνιαν την σμικροτεραν, και μετα τουτο και της Ἀραβιας τινα .... ἐχαρισατο.

[e] Some would reckon these fourteen years, not from the flight from Damascus to Jerusalem, but from the conversion; in which case the three years would be included in them. They adduce as the reason, that perhaps Paul has carried every thing back to this, which was the most remarkable event of his life. But in the Epistle to the

of Tiberius. Tiberius reigned twenty-two years and a half, minus one month. The two years which fall to the share of Tiberius, therefore, begin therefore nearly about the *middle of the twenty-first* of this monarch:—about this time Paul's conversion took place.

From the end of the administration of Felix, a chronological datum results to the Acts of the Apostles. Under Felix Paul was seized at Jerusalem and conducted a prisoner to Cæsarea, Acts xxi. 27.—xxiii. 24. There he remained until Felix was recalled by the Roman emperor, and Porcius succeeded to him: the latter immediately on the commencement of his administration, sent the Apostle to Rome, because he had desired to receive his sentence from the tribunal of the emperor, xxv. xxvi.

When then did Felix retire from his post? Josephus the Jew affords us, in some measure, a definition of the time. He says, at the very beginning of his biography, "I was born in the first year of Caius Cæsar. In my twenty-sixth year" (he continues farther on) "I was obliged to go to Rome on a commission[r]. For, when Felix had the administra-

Galatians, his conversion is less his object, than the assertion, that he had not received Christianity at Jerusalem through the instruction of the Apostles, but through a higher communication. This he assigns to the period, in which his instruction must have taken place, by a statement of the places to which he had gone, and to which he had not gone: οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσολυμα. Gal. i. 17. ἐπειτα—ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσολυμα: yet only for 15 days:—18. and ἐπειτα ἠλθον: but not to Jerusalem (21). Where *the going* and *the not going* is the main point; but not the conversion: *the subsequent going*, Gal. ii. 1. must refer to a preceding one. Thus much (not losing sight of the expression παλιν), is contained in the subject itself. But the word παλιν (παλιν ἀνεβην) where it is not used as an antithesis, is in its signification determinate and repetitive, and denotes the recurrence of the same thing, where a similar case precedes it. Besides, it may be placed for ἐκ δευτερου, το τριτον and τεταρτον.

[r] Vita. Josephi. § 3. and according to the edition of Basil, p. 626.

tion, he had sent some priests, to whom I was nearly related, to Rome, to vindicate themselves from some trifling charges. I wished to save them," &c.

Caius and Claudius together reigned seventeen years and eight months; Josephus must, consequently, have lived eight years and four months under Nero, ere he had attained his twenty-sixth year, and performed his journey to Rome. Felix was at that time still in Judæa.

So should we believe; but he was no longer in his post, when Josephus complained of his oppressions. Such an undertaking, whilst he was in authority, was hazardous in the highest degree. We also find, that immediately after his dismissal from his office his accusers appeared against him, and sought justice at Rome[g]. We must therefore admit the recal of Felix to have been before the journey of Josephus.

The subsequent condition of Felix places his recal in the seventh year of Nero. The complaints alleged by the Jews were so important and well founded, that the Governor might have forfeited his life. Nero pardoned him, solely through the intercession of Pallas. He was brother to Felix. But Pallas himself lost his life in the eighth consulate under this emperor[h]: it is therefore necessary to place the departure of Felix one year before this event.

I have clearly noticed some objections which have been made to it. In the year in which Pallas died, P. Marius and L. Asinius were consuls, Tacit. Ann. xiv. 48. and as Seneca, after the death of Burrhus,

[g] Jos. Ant. L. xx. c. 8. n. 9. Josephus went considerably later than these: for, when he executed his commission in Rome, Poppæa was already the declared spouse of the Emperor. (Vita, c. 3.) which only took place in the eighth year of Nero.

[h] Tacit. Annal. L. xiv. towards the end. Dio. Cass. L. lxii. p. 706, 707. Joseph. loc. cit.

c. 53. says in the address to Nero, "THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THY REIGN," Burrhus was perhaps still alive, when the plaintiffs appeared against Felix, Jos. Ant. xx. c. 8. n. 9.: yet he was one of the first victims, who fell in this year, to the misfortune of Rome. But I will build nothing upon this; for the year of Pallas's death is decisive; Felix must have been recalled previously to it, *i. e.* in the seventh year of Nero.

SECTION LXXVII.

AFTER having extracted the preceding events, which are united in a definite period, we are obliged to fill up a considerable interval, which is important with regard to the chronological circumstances of several of Paul's Epistles. It comprises the years, which are between the second mission of Paul on account of the obligation of the Jewish ordinances and his apprehension at Jerusalem. Some events and actions carry with them definitions of time, others again do not.

When they had returned to Antioch from their mission to the holy city, Paul and Barnabas continued their ministerial occupations, Acts xv. 35. In the mean time Peter arrived at Antioch, where the well known scene between him and Paul took place, Gal. ii. 2. After some time Paul and Barnabas resolved to undertake a second journey to the people of Asia Minor, Acts xv. 36., but separated from each other on account of Mark. Paul went afterwards with Silas. The period from the return from Jerusalem until the beginning of the journey to Asia Minor seems to comprise several months.

That which may be said of it with some probability, is, that it was not undertaken, until the most inclement part of the winter was passed. Barnabas, whose only object was to visit Cyprus, probably entered upon his journey during the autumn, that he might reach it before the setting in of winter. It would, however, be immaterial to us, whether Paul had or had not begun his journey during the harvest.

Paul, probably, at the end of the winter, commenced his journey to Cilicia, came to Pisidia, Phrygia, and Galatia, and obeyed the summons of a vision to go to Europe, embarked, travelled through Macedonia, visited Athens, and arrived at Corinth, where he remained. It was probably late in the year, when the Apostle arrived at this station, Acts xv. 40.—xviii. 1.

Here he abode one year and six months, Acts xviii. 2. From autumn until spring, six months; from spring until the following spring, one year. As soon as the sea was navigable, he embarked for Asia, Acts xviii. 18., and landed at Ephesus; but did not allow himself to be detained here on account of the Feast, which he had determined to celebrate at Jerusalem, Acts xviii. 20, 21. The feast is not named; but is most likely the Pentecost, for, with the spring voyage from Corinth, he could hardly have reached Jerusalem by this circuitous way, at the feast of the passover.

From Palestine he went on a visit to Antioch, where he staid, χρονον τινα, an indefinite time, then he travelled through Galatia and Phrygia, Acts xviii. 23, and according to his promise, came down to Ephesus. As we shall show in the treatise on the Epistle to Titus, Paul passed the winter in Ni-

copolis on the Issus, at the ports of Asia Minor. From thence he might reach Ephesus, by way of Galatia and Phrygia, in a couple of months.

At Ephesus he taught during three months in the Synagogue, which he, however, abandoned, and established his pulpit in the school of one Tyrannus, where he continued to preach for two years, Acts xix. 8, 9, 10. He had intended to stay at Ephesus till Whitsuntide, 1 Cor. xvi. 8. but was driven away sometime before, in consequence of an insurrection, Acts xix. 21.—xx. 2. He then directed his course to Macedonia, which he traversed preaching and exhorting, till he came into Greece, where he staid for three months; then he began his return, and at the end of the Paschal days embarked for Asia, xx. 3. 6. and intended, if possible, to reach Jerusalem by Whitsuntide, xx. 6. Consequently a year had elapsed from his departure from Ephesus shortly before Whitsuntide, to his arrival at Jerusalem at Whitsuntide.

We are forced particularly to notice this last voyage, on account of doubts which have been raised against the narrative[1]. Let us, therefore, accompany the Apostle, that we may convince ourselves how far the supposed difficulties are well founded. Seven days after Easter he left Philippi, and arrived at Troas five days afterwards, where he remained seven days, Acts xx. 6. From Troas he went through Assos, Mitylene, Chios, Samos, to Miletus, in four days, Acts xx. 13, 14, 15., for Assos is at a small distance from Troas, and not a day's journey, as it is stated. The ship had only to sail round Cape Lectos, and then to take in the Apostle, to continue its course to Mitylene. The days

[1] Bertholdt. Histor. Crit. Introduction to the Old and New Testament. vol. vi. note 2. to § 726. p. 3375.

hitherto enumerated are twenty-three. But it was the third of the unleavened bread, from which they commenced the computation of the fifty to Whitsuntide, consequently three days must be deducted from our account: twenty had then expired, and thirty were yet left until Whitsuntide.

The distance from Samos to Miletus is not great, compared with the other days' journeys, the ship thus arrived in broad day light at Miletus. We will, however, build nothing upon that. Paul sent to Ephesus, convoked the chiefs of the community, consoled them on their arrival, took leave, and set sail without delay, Acts xx. 16—38. The number of days is unknown, yet confessedly, this may have been performed in three days. From Miletus Paul went by Cos and Rhodes to Patara, in three days, Acts xxi. i. At Patara he was forced to go on board another vessel; what delay this caused we know not, nor do we know how long the voyage to Tyre lasted, which, at all events amounts to double the voyage from Miletus to Patara. Luke only recommences his reckoning on the continent. At Tyre they tarried seven days, Acts xxi. 4., from thence they went to Ptolemais, a day's journey, and remained there one day, xxi. 7. On the following day they went to Cæsarea, where they made a longer stay, ἡμερας πλειους, for which no definite computation exists. The known periods from Tyre to Cæsarea, allowing one day from Ptolemais to Cæsarea, amount to ten days. The time of the stay at Miletus, at Patara, of the passage to Tyre, and finally of the several days at Cæsarea is not known; —for these, however, twenty days remain. But from these we must also deduct one day for the journey from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, as well as a second, because the Apostle was already, on the day previous to the

feast, conducted to the house of James. Consequently we have still eighteen days before us for the undetermined intervals.

If then the business at Miletus was despatched in three days; if Paul could set sail on the following day from Patara; if the passage thence to Tyre was performed in six days, the number of eight days would be left for the ἡμερας πλειους at Cæsarea. There appears no impossibility in this. That the passage was favorable, we know from that part of it to Patara; that it was quick beyond expectation in the second period we know from the sequel; there would not otherwise have been so many days left, which Paul was able to dedicate to his friends at Tyre, Ptolemais, and at Cæsarea. Paul therefore arrived, according to his wish, at Jerusalem by Whitsuntide, Acts xx. 16. where he was taken to prison. From his departure from Ephesus until his apprehension at Jerusalem, nearly one year elapsed, *i. e.* from Whitsuntide to Whitsuntide.

These are the intermediate events between the mission of Paul from Antioch on account of the Jewish observances and his apprehension at Jerusalem. In part, as we have seen, they carry dates with them; in part these may be inferred with probability from circumstances; as we have discovered the first and deduced the others from inferences, they fill up the SPACE OF SEVEN YEARS. The mission, which is recorded, took place in the twelfth year of Claudius; if we start from hence, and continue our computation for seven years, we shall stop at the fifth year of Nero.

SECTION LXXVIII.

In the seventh year of Nero, Felix laid down his office in Judæa. Paul had passed two whole years in prison under him, Acts xxiv. 27., consequently he was seized in the fifth year of Nero. The periods, compared with the computation in the preceding sections, coincide exactly with each other. Festus now cited Paul before him, and after some intermediate occurrences, sent him to Rome according to his desire.

The year was far advanced; yet on account of the deviations of the Jewish months from equations, until the intercalation, each time, brought the year again into the track of the seasons, the measure of time according to our monthly computations, can only be discovered by entering into tedious particulars. Thus far we may with certainty assume, that the fast of the seventh month fell as late as possible, Acts xxvii. 9. in which case it ended on our second of October. The Apostle was obliged to stay for three months during the winter in Malta, Acts xxviii. 2. that is, till March, when navigation again commenced. Thenceforward the voyage continued without interruption; the Apostle arrived at Rome in the spring of the eighth year of Nero's reign; he remained there two full years, and was set at liberty in the spring of the tenth year of Nero; not without a fortunate dispensation; for in this very year, during the autumn, Nero's persecution broke out.

* * * * * * * *

The Apostle, as we perceive from some of his Epistles, which he wrote from Rome, intended to visit his friends again in the East; on the other hand

he expresses his wish in the Epistle to the Romans to go to Spain, when he had seen Rome.

One of the most ancient Christian records assures us, that the latter took place. He went to the western limits of the globe ἐπι τερμα δυσεως, and died after his return ἐπι των ἡγουμενων[k]. I do not see what can be objected to the account of a man who was confidentially intimate with the Apostle, and who lived in Rome, from whence the journey was undertaken, unless the record be rejected with the greatest injustice; especially as he wrote this to the Corinthian community, which had means of being acquainted with the fortunes of Paul, who, not so very long ago, had lived and taught among them.

But if it be resolved not to acknowledge the writing, as a work of Clemens, the advantage in favor of its opponents is not very great. They cannot, at all events, deny that the Epistle existed in the second century. The author was then, according to time, fully qualified to speak from accredited traditions. And now one word more. In the second century, the church of Corinth was also capable of knowing, whether the Epistle were authentic, and on the other hand, of objecting to it; yet they, every year, publicly read it in their congregations, down to the times of Eusebius, thus annually renewing the testimony of its authenticity.

The words ἐπι των ἡγουμενων may be understood of the last times of Nero, in which Tigellinus and Nymphidius Sabinus governed arbitrarily, and also afterwards, when Sabinus claimed the sword from Tigellinus and affected the management of affairs

[k] Clem. Rom. Epist. 1. ad Corinth. Sect. 5.

for Galba until his arrival[l]. In this case the explanation accords with the other accounts, which impute the death of the Apostle to Nero's reign. At least, no power of a new Emperor was instrumental to his execution. A second exposition, which refers in the words ἐπι των ἡγουμενων to the times of Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, disclaims agreement with the rest of the historical declarations[m].

But the first happened at least, in part. The fact immediately follows, according to the succession of time, the voyage to the western frontier of the continent, and immediately precedes the death of the Apostle, of which it was the principal cause. Paul attempted to go to the East, and arrived as far as Corinth, where he met Peter, connected himself with him, and went with him to Rome. This Dionysius of Corinth testifies; he says Peter and Paul met each other in our Corinth, and went together to Italy, where they died on account of Christianity[n]. In the eleventh year of Nero, Peter was yet in Asia, provided he wrote from Babylon his first Epistle on account of the alarms occasioned by the persecution of Nero. (See Section 162.) About this time Paul was on his journey to the western border, so that they could not have met each other in Corinth, before the twelfth year of Nero.

We here insert as a synopsis of the history of the

[l] Plutarch in Galbâ, c. 8.

[m] It is true that the ancients mention the reign of Nero; yet they differently state the time. The most definite account I find in Jerome Script. Eccles. v. Paul. Hic ergo decimo quarto Neronis anno, eôdem die, quô Petrus Romæ capite truncatus . . . . anno post passionem Domini tricessimo septimo.

[n] Apud Euseb. H. E. L. II. c. 25.

Apostle Paul, according to the chronological data which we have discovered, at able from the time of his conversion to that of his liberation from the Roman prison.

The XXIst year of Tiberius (about the middle of it) or $\frac{21}{12}$, in the Christian æra, is the commencement of Paul's conversion. . 36

The XXIIIrd or last of Tiberius, and the first of Caius Cæsar, are . . . 38
The IInd year from Caius Cæsar is . . 39
Paul escapes from Damascus, and goes to Jerusalem.

The IVth year of Claudius Cæsar (at the commencement) is 45
Paul's first mission from Antioch to Jerusalem.

The XIIth year of Claudius is . . 53
Paul's second mission from Antioch to Jerusalem.

The XIIIth year of Claudius is . . 54
Paul travels at the end of winter through Asia Minor to Europe as far as Corinth, here he preaches in the following autumn.

The XIVth year of Claudius is . . 55
Paul is at Corinth during the winter and spring till the following autumn.

The Ist year of Nero is . . . 56
Paul is during the winter at Corinth; embarks for Asia in the spring; arrives at Jerusa-

lem at the Pentecost; and then goes to Antioch.

The IInd year of Nero is 57
Paul winters at Nicopolis, goes to Ephesus and preaches there.

The IIIrd year of Nero is 58
Paul preaches at Ephesus.

The IVth year of Nero is 59
Paul is at Ephesus and in Asia till the Pentecost,—embarks for Macedonia.

The Vth year of Nero is 60
Paul winters in Achaia, arrives again at Jerusalem at the Pentecost,—is apprehended.

The VIth year of Nero is 61
Paul in prison at Cæsarea.

The VIIth year of Nero is 62
Paul in prison at Cæsarea,—is sent to Rome in the autumn.

The VIIIth year of Nero is . . . 63
Paul arrives in the spring,—is a prisoner at Rome.

The IXth year of Nero is 64
Paul is a prisoner at Rome.

The Xth year of Nero is 65
Paul is liberated in the spring.

Let us say a few words more in explanation of

this chronological table. Jesus was entering on the XXXth year of his life, in the XVth year of Tiberius's reign, when the baptism was administered to him, Luke iii. 23. ὡσει ἐτων τριακοντα ἀρχομενος. This determination of time I here assume to be correct, without any farther investigation, which, since it requires a treatise to itself, I must here prove. The baptism preceded the first passover, nearly fifty or sixty days, forty of which were spent in the desert: the rest belong to the preceding events at Bethabara, and in Galilee, John i. 29.—ii. 13. The beginning of these fifty or sixty days before the passover, falls in the month of February. But February is about the middle of the XVth year of Tiberius's reign. For Augustus, from whose death the commencement of Tiberius's reign must be counted, died on the 19th of August[o]. From about the middle of February till the middle of August six months expired; there are consequently six more wanting to complete the year.

Tiberius died in the XXIIIrd year of his detested reign, on the 16th of the month of March[p]. If the XXXth of Jesus began in the middle of his XVth year, or in February, the XXXVIIIth Christian year must have begun in the middle of his XXIIIrd. Since he, as we have said, died in March, he did not live longer than one month in this XXXVIIIth Christian year. It continues consequently in the

[o] Dio. Cass. L. LVI. p. 590. Wechel. says: τῃ ἐννεᾳ και δεκατῃ του Αὐγουστου. Sueton. c. 100. in Aug. says the same according to Roman mode; decimâ quartâ Kal. Septemb.

[p] Tacit. L. VI. Ann. c. 50. Sueton. Tiber. c. 73. Eutrop. c. II. agree as to xvii. Kal. April. but Dio. Cass. L. LVIII. fin. τῃ ἑκτῃ και εἰκοστῃ του Μαρτιου ἡμερᾳ has by mistake read vii. Kal. for xvii. Kal. The declaration of Josephus is very exact, Bell. Jud. L. II. c. 9. n. 5. ἐτη δυο προς εἰκοσι και τρεις ἡμερας ἐπι μησιν ἑξ.

first of Caius Cæsar; and his second is the XXXIXth of the Christian æra.

Caius did not terminate his fourth or last year; he had attained the highest Power in March, and died on the 24th of January [q]. This however makes little difference to the Christian year, which continues to run on pretty much the same under his successor.

Claudius assumed the government, and administered it full thirteen years, and a part of the 14th until the middle of October [r]. The year of Nero, which begins from thence, consequently precedes the Christian by nearly one quarter of a year and some days.

[q] Sueton. in Caio. c. 58. Nono Kal. Febr. and c. 59. imperavit triennio, et decem mensibus, diebus octo. Joseph. B. Jud. L. II. c. 11. has probably mistaken μηνας ὀκτω for diebus octo.

[r] Sueton. Claud. c. 45. excessit. iii. Idus Octobris. cf. Tacit. Ann. xii. 69. Dio. L. LXI. cap. penult gives it correctly; μετηλλαξε τῃ τριτῃ καὶ δεκατῃ τοῦ Ὀκτωβριου.

CHAPTER II.

THE WRITINGS OF THE APOSTLE PAUL.

SECTION LXXIX.

SAUL, שאול, or Paul, as he called himself, when he was among the Greeks, or in memory of that first illustrious Disciple, with whom he found access and a favourable reception[a], viz. Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus (for here this application occurs for the first time, Acts xiii. 9.), was a Roman citizen, born at Tarsus in Cilicia, a city which, in the days of Strabo[b], stood next to Athens and Alexandria in arts and sciences. He learned (according to the ancient Jewish proverb: He who does not teach his son a trade, trains him to steal) the trade of a tent-cloth maker[c]. He very early displayed an uncom-

[a] Hieronym. in Catal. v. Paulus: quumque primum ad predicationem ejus Sergius Paulus Proconsul Cypri, credidisset, ab eo, quod cum Christi fidei subjugârat, sortitus est nomen Paulus. Origen. Præf. in Ep. ad Rom. T. iv. p. 460. Ruæi.

[b] Strabo Geogr. L. xiv. p. 463. Ed. Casaub. 1587.

[c] Σκηνοποιος, Acts xiii. 3. Michaelis, from this expression, wished to make him a mechanic: for in antient comedy σκηνοποιος was, according to Pollux, equivalent to μηχανοποιος: τους δε μηχανοποιους και σκηνοποιους ἡ παλαια κωμῳδια ὠνομαζε. Edit. Grynæi, Col. 415. But this scholar has misunderstood the author: the question here is only of the theatre and its machineries: the expression ἡ παλαια κωμῳδια, is placed for the technical language of the comedians. In this manner, in a perfectly parallel passage, are ἡ νεα and ἡ ἀρχαια

mon harshness of character, and an intolerant stubbornness. By these qualities he was distinguished even as a youth at the stoning of Stephen. Acts vii. 58., viii. 1, 2, 3.

These dispositions developed themselves, under public favour, freely and uninterruptedly, even to petulant cruelty. He was ferocious, intruding into houses for the purpose of discovering the Christians; he dragged forth men and women, to take them to

κωμῳδια is used: ἡ δε νεα κωμῳδια και προσωποποιον εἰρηκεν, ὁν ἡ ἀρχαια σκευοποιον ἐκαλει. Col. 91. Cf. Schol. Minor in Sophocl. Ajac. edit. Brunckii ad v. 3. For the machinery, which introduced the *Deus ex machinâ*, was adjoined to the scenes, and was a part of them as the Lexicographer declares, περι μερων θεατρου, col. 229. They might, therefore, both have been the work of the same artist, wherefore he was alternately called a constructor of machinery, and a constructor of scenes, just as in the second passage he is at one time called a vizard-maker, and at another a maker of implements. The preparation of theatrical stages was certainly not the work of Paul; the Fathers of the Church called him σκυτοτομος and σκηνορραφος, a maker of tents from skins. *Suicer. Thesaur. philol.* p. 982. They were apparently induced from the military tents to acount him a worker in leather: for these tents were prepared from the skins of animals, whence proceed the phrases of the ancients: *exercitum sub pellibus habere, pellibus continere militem, etc.* The native land of the Apostle gives to us the best explanation respecting his profession; it produced very shaggy and rough-haired goats and rams, whence Κιλικιος τραγος became a proverbial expression, to signify a man by no means well bred. From the hair of these the Cilicians manufactured a thick and coarse sort of cloth, which was thence called *cilicium, cilicia*, Κιλικια: Κιλικιος τραγος, ὁ δασυς, τοιουτοι γαρ ἐν Κιλικιᾳ γινονται τραγοι, ὁθεν και τα ἐκ των τριχων συντιθεμενα Κιλικια καλοῦνται. *Suidas. Cf. Hesych. et Salmas. in Solinum.* p. 347. As to the use of these in war and navigation, cf. *Veget. de re Mil.* L. iv. c. 6. *et Servium in Georg.* L. iii. v. 112. But they were principally used by the Nomades in Syria, and along the banks of the Euphrates, for SHEPHERD'S TENTS. *Plin. Histor. Nat.* L. vi. c. 28. Nomades, infestatoresque Chaldæorum scenitæ . . . . . et ipsi vagi, sed à tabernaculis cognominati, quæ *ciliciis* metantur, ubi libuit. This article of national industry Paul also had chosen for his business, and was a tent-cloth maker.

prison, Acts viii. 1—4. But this sphere of operation became soon too confined for him: Jerusalem became too narrow for his blood-thirstiness. He offered himself to the Sanhedrin, and solicited permission to persecute the Christians in Damascus and on the way to it, where he put in chains persons of all ages and sexes, with inhuman satisfaction. Acts xi. 1, 2., xxii. 4.

This most violent man, having such terrible propensities, whose turbulent impulses rendered him of a most enterprising character, would have become nothing better than a John of Gishala, a blood-intoxicated zealot, (ἐμπνεων ἀπειλης και φονου, Acts ix. 1.) had not his whole soul been changed by an unexpected catastrophe.

SECTION LXXX.

The harsh tone of his mind inclined him to the principles of Pharisaism, which had all the appearance of severity, and was the pre-dominant party among the Jews.

He partly received his literary instruction from Gamaliel, a teacher of great consideration at that time, Acts xxii. 4. He learned from him the Law and the Jewish traditional doctrines, πατρικας παραδοσεις. His disposition promised an indefatigable and a persevering scholar, and the sequel showed, that he really was so. He understood all the Biblical modes of explanation current at that time, Allegory, Typology, Accommodation, and Tradition. He was also far from being a stranger to Greek literature. Acts xvii. 28. 1 Cor. xv. 33. Tit. i. 12.

Nature had not withholden from him the external

endowments of eloquence, although he afterwards spoke very modestly of them. At Lystra he was deemed the tutelar God of eloquence.

SECTION LXXXI.

This character, qualified for great things, but not master of himself from excess of internal power, was an extreme of human dispositions, and, according to the natural course, was prone to absolute extremities. His religion was a destructive zeal, his anger was fierceness, his fury required victims. A ferocity so boisterous did not *psychologically* qualify him for a Christian, nor for a philanthropist; but, least of all, for a quietly enduring man. He, nevertheless, became all this on his conversion to Christianity, and each bursting emotion of his mind subsided directly into a well-regulated and noble character.

Formerly hasty and irritable, now only spirited and resolved; formerly violent, now full of energy and enterprising: once ungovernably refractory against every thing which obstructed him, now only persevering; once fanatical and morose, now only serious; once cruel, now only severe; once a harsh zealot, now fearing God; formerly unrelenting, deaf to sympathy and commiseration, now himself acquainted with tears, which he had seen without effect in others. Formerly the friend of none, now the brother of mankind, well-meaning, compassionate, sympathizing; yet never weak, always great, in the midst of sadness and sorrow manly and noble; so he shewed himself at his deeply moving departure from Miletus (Acts xx.): it is like the departure of

Moses, like the resignation of Samuel, sincere and heartfelt, full of self-recollection, and in the midst of pain full of dignity.

Thus his mind not only received a different impulse, and his constantly excited irritability not only a different point of action; but this untamed disposition was so brought to a state of equability in all its inclinations and passions, that his great powers became harmoniously blended in a new tone of mind, from the accordance of which his elevated character springs forth.

If this, as it is described to us, was the result of his conversion, every one may judge for himself, whether these are traits of an unregulated head, or of a man, who, having more than ordinary propensities, acts with reflection according to established laws. We shall therefore be easily able also to answer to ourselves the question: how far his share in Christianity was seriously grounded in his mind and moral consciousness?

SECTION LXXXII.

His writings are a true expression of this character. They testify an independent spirit, whose conceptions and ideas originate in himself, and are also treated in his own peculiar way, in the communication and representation of them. Even the same thought, if it often occurs in his writings, always contains something new in his application and expression of it. In the production and description, a lively and active spirit is manifested, which is in possession of a convertible store of ideas, and of a peculiar felicity in imparting them.

So is it also with regard to the tone predominant

in them. Severity, manly seriousness, and sentiments which ennoble the heart, are interchanged with mildness, affability and sympathy: and their transitions are such, as nature begets in the heart of a man penetrated by his subject,—noble and discerning. He exhorts, reproaches and consoles again, he attacks with energy, urges with impetuosity, then again he speaks kindly to the soul; he displays his finer feelings for the welfare of others, his forbearance and his fear of afflicting any body: all as the subject, time, opposite dispositions and circumstances require.

There prevails throughout in them an importuning language, an earnest and lively communication. Rom. i. 26—32. is a comprehensive and vigorous description of morals. His antitheses, Rom. ii. 21. —24., 2 Cor. iv. 8—12., vi. 9—11., ix. 22—30.; his enumerations 1 Cor. xiii. 4—10., 2 Cor. vi. 4—7., 2 Tim. iii. 1—5., Ephes. iv. 4—7., v. 3—6.; his gradations Rom. viii. 29, 30., Tit. iii. 3, 4.—the interrogations, exclamations and comparisons, sometimes animate his language even so as to give a visible existence to it. The comparison in 1 Cor. xii. 14. is like that of Menenius Agrippa, and is even more ornamented and expressive.

He bestowed however little pains on the cultivation of his style, as his thoughts and feelings flowed from his pen, so they remained. There is no where any trace of the polishing touch, or of that artificial care, with which the ancients imparted the finishing character to their works. Thence his expression is often careless, his construction loose or even obscure, full of incisions or long parentheses. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 4. from Θεου την εν πιστει to v. 18. ταυτην την επαγγ. 2 Cor. iii. 14—18., iv. 7—9., Ephes. ii. 1—5., Rom. ii. 13—16., xii. 4—15., &c.

SECTION LXXXIII.

Notwithstanding these defects in rhetoric, I look upon him as a great orator, and I should even be inclined to compare him, as far as regards eloquence, to the renowned orators of antiquity—for instance, to Isocrates, whose addresses to Demonicus and partly to Nicocles more nearly resemble Paul in design and object. In eloquence, I have said;—for although the Judæo-Greek dialect of the Apostle remains far behind the Attic euphony of the orator, this, independently of the art which he did not possess, is a result of talents and qualities, of conviction, of sympathy, and of an entire persuasion of the subject and importance of his assertions, and in this manner is cultivated to a greatness, after which art often strives in vain. But I cannot here pursue this parallel and willingly resign it to every one to believe it or not: but I cannot here pass by the judgment of a critic, whose candour and competency deserve a peculiar notice.

This is Dionysius Longinus, who makes honorable mention of the Apostle's eloquence in the following passage: "Demosthenes, Lysias, Æschines, Hyperides, Isæus, Dinarchus or Demosthenes Crithinus, Isocrates, Antiphon, are the perpetual coronis of all eloquence and of Greek genius—*to these may also be added Paul of Tarsus, who was the first, to my knowledge, who did not make use of Demonstration.*"

I am aware that the latter part of this passage has been questioned by illustrious critics, by Fabricius

and Ruhnken[d]; nevertheless I think that something may be said in its defence, especially as the two scholars have rather given judgment against it from mere critical suspicion than from any foundation. We must in the first place, consider the passage so far as the force of words is concerned. Paul made use of δογματος ἀναποδεικτου. Longinus distinguished in oratory the αποδεικτικον from the το κατα φαντασιαν ἐκπληκτικον, the *genus demonstrativum* from that which exclusively operates upon the feelings and passions[e]. When he then, as in this place, speaks of orators, the δογμα ἀναποδεικτον is a discourse, which pays less regard to demonstration than to the excitement of the audience[f]. Accord-

[d] Fabric. Biblioth. Græc. L. iv. p. 444. Ed. Hamb. Ruhnkenius in not. ad Rutil. Lupum. de figur. Sentent. p. 88. According to the correction of the latter I adduce the passage of Longinus, which otherwise occupies the first place among the fragments: Κορωνις δ' ἐστω λογου παντος και φρονηματος Ἑλληνικου Δημοσθενης, Λυσιας, Αἰσχινης, Ὑπεριδης, Ἰσαιος, Δειναρχος, Δημοσθενης ὁ Κριθινος, Ἰσοκρατης, Ἀντιφων, προς τουτοις Παυλος ὁ Ταρσευς, ὀντινα και πρωτον φημι προϊσταμενον δογματος ἀναποδεικτου. It is well known that Dinarchus, by way of jest, was called Δημοσθενης Κριθινος and ἀγριος; it should therefore be stated here, that this is only a nickname of Dinarchus, to prevent readers from taking it for two persons. This is not done by Ruhnken's correction. The text before Ruhnken even had made the clumsy mistake of putting Isocrates in the middle between Dinarchus and Demosthenes Crithinus: Δειναρχος, Ἰσοκρατης, Δημοσθενης Κριθ. This may perhaps formerly have been read: Δειναρχος, ἰσως κατ' ἐπικλην Δημοσθενης ὁ Κριθινος, Ἰσοκρατης. The words after Δειναρχος were then falsely read for Isocrates, and as this name was already there, it was erased after Κριθινος, and in this manner the more ancient text might have originated.

[e] Περι ὑψ. xv. n. 11.

[f] Το ἀναποδεικτον is generally in scientific language that which is not supported by proof, or a position, which is accepted as admitted κατα συγχωρησιν λαμβανομενον, for the sake of drawing inferences

ingly the phrase προϊστασθαι δογματος, which is not frequent, is also a phrase of Longinus and is again found in his treatise, περι τελους against Plotinus and Amelius, of which Porphyry has preserved to us a fragment: οὐκ ὀλιγοι των ἐν φιλοσοφια λογων προεστησαν [f].

Thus, the passage, taken as it is, sounds, as to the sense, uncommonly natural in the mouth of a heathen philosopher. Paul seems to the critic, to persuade rather than to prove, and not without reason; for the Apostle either pre-supposes certain doctrines as known, and joins others to them, or he cites passages from the Old Testament, the demonstrative force of which the heathen did not understand, and which he was forced therefore to consider as mere erudition and literary embellishment. Viewing the matter then, as he was obliged to view it, he could remark nothing more accurately concerning him, than that he, the first among all his predecessors, applied himself less to proofs than to the excitement of the passions and Pathos.

The internal arguments, the expression and the appearance, are in this manner so far from furnishing a sign of an interpolation, that the whole turns out rather in favor of our author. This is also the case with the external.

Dionysius Longinus belonged to the Neo-Platonic School, which was pretty familiar with the Christian writings. Porphyry, his scholar, has in fifteen books against the Christians not any where attacked the New Testament in general, but extracted and

from it. Sextus. Empir. Pyrrhon. Hypoth. L. ii. c. 6. n. 54. and L. ii. c. 15. n. 168. When Morus wishes to explain these expressions (Lib. animadv. in Longin. p. 54.) from the Christian phraseology, he pre-supposes the interpolation.

[f] Longin. ex edit. Mori. p. 277 and 264.

dismembered detached passages from it. Amelius, the cotemporary of Longinus, was anxious to discover the doctrine of the Platonic Logos in the Gospel of John [h].

At that time, in the days of Longinus, the Christians publicly celebrated Divine worship in the states of his pupil and friend Zenobia, and Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was known and favored at her court, whence the critic must have been intimately acquainted with him. They were, according to strong probability [i], fellow countrymen, both from Samosata, and perhaps formerly friends in their younger days; but even independently of this circumstance it is evident from the situation of the philosopher, that he could hardly have been destitute of information respecting the writings of the Christians.

Lastly, he has also, in his work upon the Sublime, ix. 10. made very honorable mention of the Mosaic book of the creation. If the books of the Jews attracted his attention, those of the Christians also could not have escaped his thirst of knowledge; and if he impartially acknowledges the merit of the former, the judgment of such an equitable critic concerning the Apostle cannot surprise us.

SECTION LXXXIV.

Some perhaps will now expect that I should point out the peculiarities in the doctrinal system of Paul,

[h] Euseb. Præp. Evang. L. xi. Theodoret de curand. Græc. aff. L. ii. Cyrill. contra Julian L. viii.

[i] Hudson. præf. in Longin. Oxon. 1718. which shows from an ancient inscription, that the family of Longinus was resident at Samosata.

and that I should transfuse into them his spirit: or, others, who require not so much, that I should discover the intermediate ideas, by means of which he has connected together the principal points of a common doctrine, and has combined them in his writings, so as to be perfectly intelligible. But both make requisitions, which, even if no one else had any thing to object to them, are easily made, being easily conceived: but I apprehend that as yet we have not arrived so far, as to distinguish between the structure and the scaffolding which belongs to it.

That however which we principally perceive in Paul, and from which his whole actions and operations become intelligible, is the peculiar impression, which the idea of an universal religion has wrought upon his mind. His exalted idea of maintaining that which was most excellent and Divine in the religious opinions of a disowned and sinking nation, of preserving them in a doctrinal system which not only far surpassed all that existed, but, by the expositions which he annexed to it, satisfied all the expectations of futurity, which bore with it the infallible seal of truth, being adapted to all mankind, ages, and future nations, when they understood it:—this idea of establishing a religion for the world had not so profoundly engrossed any soul, no where kindled so much vigour, and projected it into such a constant energy.

In this he was no man's scholar,—this he had immediately received from the spirit of his Master; it was a spark of the Divine light, which enkindled him. It was this, which never allowed him to remain in Palestine and in Syria, which so powerfully impelled him to foreign parts. The portion of his brethren was Judæa and its environs: but his mis-

sion was directed to the nations, and his allotment was the whole of the heathen world. Thus he began his career among the different nations of Asia Minor, and when this limit also became too confined for him, he went with equal confidence to Europe among other nations, ordinances, sciences, and customs; and here likewise he finally with the same indefatigable spirit circulated his plans, even to the pillars of Hercules.

Hence, scrupulously as he accommodated himself to the Jewish method of teaching, he ceded nothing, where the subject itself was concerned: hence he disapproved of the compliance of Peter and possessed not the forbearance of James, and made no allowance for the ancient adherence to Judaism, as soon as the question related to opinions and institutions, which excluded other nations and people, and were not adapted to all countries and ages; hence, he vigorously attacked the constitution of Judaism, hence he was proclaimed an enemy to Moses and the Law, and encompassed his life with dangers. It was this idea, which directed his whole life in a peculiar manner, which is transfused every where through his writings, in which his peculiar views on this subject are often indicated by slight traits.

In this manner Paul prepared the overthrow of two religions, that of his ancestors, and that of the heathens; how well timed it was, this is not the place to investigate. Let us leave it undetermined, whether they both, in their then condition, were of any utility; poets may indeed regret, that the poetical religion of the Greeks, and of the Romans, which had enriched itself from it, with all their delightful μυθοι, sunk down into the lap of time; but it was in vain to direct an age, which had ceased to be Platonic, by means of the αἰσθητικον, and the subsequent events,

which gradually were produced, the civilization of barbarous nations, whom the Roman arms had disturbed, required something more than Greek fables, which were neither contained nor perceived under a Heaven, which was not at all Ionic or Attic.

But why did Paul teach so much after the Jewish method? why did he wrap up his discourse so much in the erudition of Palestine, in preaching the religion of the world? The education of his youth, the custom of the age, and the persons whom he had before him, demanded it. In every place under Heaven, whither he went, he had always first and principally to do with Jews. Though he had understood the Socratic obstetric art, as the philosopher called it, though he had known how to bring to light the thoughts from the human mind, or from its darkest consciousness, though he had possessed the nobleness of Plato in his representations, or if we would rather regard him as an orator, though he had possessed the art of the ten orators, with all this he would with difficulty have gained a single Jew. With this profane eloquence philosophers must stand at the door in the synagogue: the Jews required, in matters of religion, the language of religion, the instruction, the expressions, the metaphors, and the images of their nation.

That Paul now likewise met with heathens in the religious houses of the Jews was one of those circumstances of the time, which were of essential service to Christianity; for there was no other place, which he could enter as teacher before them. In the Temples there were nothing but offerings, on the forum there were nothing but laws and lawsuits; for his speaking and teaching publicly at Athens is to be attributed to the regulations peculiar to this city. But, dissatisfaction with the established religious notions,

or the propensity to superstition might have been the cause; suffice it to say, that there was a great number of heathens, who were sincerely devoted to Judaism, and frequented the Sabbatic assemblies [k]. In this manner, Christianity came to their ears, and then extended itself farther among their fellow-citizens; they were called σεβομενοι and *metuentes*, some of whom Paul also found at Thessalonica, in particular.

But even these, who were already acquainted with the religious notions of the Jews, had habituated themselves to instructions in their mode of teaching and technical language. He was consequently obliged to continue, where others had left off, and to avail himself of that which was prepared for him.

[k] Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 18. n. 2. and c. 20. n. 2. In Spon's Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grece, et du Levant, Tom. i. 398. ed. 1679, occurs an inscription of Thyatira, in which a native of Thyatira had even contracted for his burying-place in a garden near a synagogue: ΦΑΒΙΟΣ ΖΟΣΙΜΟΣ ΚΑΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΑΣ ΣΟΡΟΝ ΕΘΕΤΟ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΠΟΥ ΚΑΘΑΡΟΥ ΟΝΤΟΣ ΠΡΟ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΟΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΩΙ ΣΑΜΒΑΘΕΙΩΙ ΕΝ ΤΩΙ ΧΑΛΛΑΙΟΥ ΠΕΡΙΒΟΛΩΙ..... An inscription relative to this subject, which was found in Istria, is in Gruter. Thesaur. Inscript. p. 271. n. 11. AUR. SOTER. ET AUR. STEPHANUS AUR. SOTERIAE MATRI PIENTISS. RELIGIONI JUDAICAE METUENTI. A similar one from the same place is in Apianus Inscript. sacros. vetust. p. ccclviii. I do not know whether Gruter has given it, not having his book now before me. RELIGIONI JUDAICAE METUENTI P. P. AELIUS PRISCILIANUS ET AELIA CHRESTE VIVI SIBI POSUERUNT.... We shall say more upon this subject, when we come to the Epistle to the Romans.

SECTION LXXXV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

THESSALONICA, the capital of the second Macedonian Region according to the division of Æmilius Paulus [l], and on the whole the greatest city in this country [m], was afterwards the seat of the Roman Prætor. It was well peopled [n], and sufficiently rich to inspire with courage the hosts of Brutus and Cassius, to whom the promise was made of plundering it as the reward of victory [o]. It is even at this day a considerable mercantile city, and contains a great number of Jews.

We know of little that is brilliant in the state of morality in this place. But the female sex of that place, in particular, had little pretension to the credit of that chaste seclusion, which so much adorns this sex; and this virtue stood generally in this city so little in public estimation, that satire was able to choose it as the theatre of the excursions of its wanton fancy [p].

Paul soon after his first voyage to Europe attempted here to introduce Christianity. He entered into the synagogue, which was the only place where he, as a stranger, could harangue the multitude on religion and morality. For three successive Sabbaths he there spoke of Christ or the Messiah,

l Livius L. XLV. 29.

m Lucian. Lucius, sive asinus. πολις των ἐν Μακεδονιᾳ μεγιστη.

n Strabo Geogr. L. vii. μαλιστα των ἀλλων εὐανδρουσα.

o Appian de Bell. Civil. L. IV. c. 18.

p Lucian. Lucius sive as. n. 50, 51, 52. T. vi. Bipont, p. 191.

and proved from the Scripture that he must needs have suffered and have risen from the dead, and that Jesus was the Messiah, Acts xvii. 2—9. The Jews were displeased at this doctrine; but he had the consolation of obtaining approbation and disciples among the heathens. For, among them were many *Metuentes*, who visited the synagogue, and were initiated into Judaism, yet without having imbibed the prejudices and national obstinacy of this nation, which might have prevented them from appreciating and estimating that which is superior.

These then, viz. the religious heathens, adhered to the Apostle, and men and women in great numbers embraced the faith. The Jews did not observe this loss with indifference, their jealousy was awakened. They excited a commotion: drove Paul and Silas from the city; and after these had fled, they vented the whole of their anger on those, who had embraced the doctrines of the Apostle.

The Proselytes had scarcely enjoyed the first instruction, ere Paul was forced to betake himself to flight. Many things must have therefore remained dark to them, and doubts must have arisen respecting many particulars of his doctrinal discourses, which nobody was now able to resolve to them. According to Luke's description of the outlines of this instruction, Acts xvii. 3—7., he entirely insisted upon the dignity of Jesus as the Messiah, which necessarily includes his royal office, and his judicial authority over the world. But on our own resurrection as well as on other subjects, he had, according to this account, not yet expatiated. It is even evident from that, which follows, that Paul had pre-supposed the knowledge of these more ancient Jewish doctrines or that he had not yet noticed them.

The prospect of a last judgment, which the Mes-

siah was to execute, was gratifying to many, because they hoped, that the opposers of the doctrine which they now professed would be soon covered with shame, and that the triumph of Christianity would publicly do them justice, 2 Thessal. i. 6, 7. Circumstances rendered these hopes still more lively. They had to endure grievous oppressions from the exasperated zealots of the law; they longed therefore the more ardently for the day of their glorification, and interpreted, according to their wishes, the doctrine of the Apostle respecting a speedy advent of the Lord.

Consequently as they were deficient in instruction respecting the resurrection, some could not suppress their fear, that if this day should be yet far distant, they should be deprived of the happiness of witnessing it, and of participating in this joyful catastrophe, 1 Thessal. iv. 13.

Others again were alarmed at the idea of such a judgment being able to bring to light even their failings, and to resent their foibles with severity; for many had not yet been able to divest themselves of old propensities, particularly such as incontinence and idleness.

SECTION LXXXVI.

The Apostle, as we have said, was driven from Thessalonica, and went to the adjacent Berœa, Acts xvii. 10., where he was joyfully received, but was soon discovered by the Thessalonian Jews and persecuted afresh. He also fled from this place, but left Silas and Timothy behind, Acts xvii. 14. From Berœa,

Timothy, by the Apostle's command, visited the Salonians once more, 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2. 5., and Paul went to Athens, where he intended to await the companions whom he had left behind, Acts xvii. 15., but he had already reached Corinth, ere they joined him, Acts xviii. 5.

Here Paul learned from them the state and concerns of the community at Salonichi, and resolved to encourage and console them by an Epistle. At that time in the presence of Timothy and Sylvanus, 1 Thess. i. 1., as soon as Timothy had joined him, ἀρτι ἐλθοντος Τιμοθεου, 1 Thess. iii. 6., consequently in the beginning of his residence at Corinth, he wrote an epistle to them, the first of those which are extant, according to the preceding investigations relative to the chronology of the Acts of the Apostles, in the thirteenth year of Claudius.

SECTION LXXXVII.

The contents are as follow; I praise your faith and constancy in suffering; herein ye resemble me. I preached unto you under persecutions without self-advantage, only for your benefit—ii. 17. I often longed for you, and sent Timothy in my place to strengthen you; he brought me joyful accounts: God grant to you strength to do what is good! iv. I must however remind you, to abstain from fornication; with regard to benevolence it is not necessary to exhort you; but it is necessary that every one work, and become not a burden to the other, iv. 13. Yet be not concerned, that ye live not to see the advent of the Lord. Our hopes end not like those

of the heathens with this state of existence; the dead also must rise again to participate in them. But no one knows the time of his advent; therefore hold yourselves in readiness.

SECTION LXXXVIII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

Whilst they were anxiously expecting the advent of the Lord, they received the first epistle of the Apostle. As he had therein upbraided them for some faults, their consciences caused many to become less desirous, and even fearful of the Lord's advent. Soon after, another Epistle appeared under the Apostle's name, which announced the approaching moment of the Lord's appearance; nothing more was wanting to render them completely disconsolate, 2 Thess. ii. 2. This epistle was indeed fictitious, but it had its full effect. It was probably written by one of their own community: for the author was acquainted with their situation, knew their expectations, their fear and hopes. It might therefore have been written less with a bad intention than with the view of accelerating the amendment of some.

Paul was soon apprised of the state and perplexity of the Thessalonians; he could no longer leave them in so lamentable a condition. He was still at Corinth, when he wrote his second epistle to them under these circumstances; for Timothy and Silas were still with him, 2 Thess. i. 1. Acts xviii. 5., both of whom left him at his departure from Corinth Acts xviii. 18., one of whom does not reappear there

until a long time afterwards, and the other, (Silas,) entirely retired from the theatre of events, xix. 22. It was therefore at Corinth, that he learned this occurrence, and the consternation of the Thessalonian community, and from whence he consoled them by a second epistle in the fourteenth year of Claudius.

SECTION LXXXIX.

I THANK GOD, (so he writes) that your faith and perseverance augment under affliction. Jesus will recompense you and your enemies for all on the day of his advent—ii. Moreover, let nothing, not even any epistle in my name, intimidate you, as if the Lord were so near; idolatry must attain its highest state of presumption, before the time of punishment arrives—ii. 22.; but we, brethren, thank God, that he has appointed us to glory: persevere in your faith, pray that God may assist you—iii. 6. But there are refractory persons among you, particularly idlers; separate yourselves from them, if they will not be reformed. For your security in future I annex my signature. The grace of God be with you!

SECTION XC.

THE EPISTLE TO TITUS.

PAUL went from Corinth, where he had written the two preceding epistles to Ephesus. There he resided some weeks and composed this instruction for Titus.

The Apostle says, that he had left Titus behind him in Crete, Tit. i. 5. But this is the only one of all his journeys, in which he could have come to Crete.

The first time when he proceeded from Syria to go among the Gentiles, his journey was directed through the provinces of Asia Minor, and his return was by land to Antioch. When he afterwards started again he went through the same road and countries, and proceeded towards Troas, from whence he visited Macedonia, and came to Athens and Corinth.

When he left this town, he embarked at its eastern port at Cenchrea, with the intention of landing at Ephesus, Acts xviii. 18. This time alone was he so near to Crete, as to have had an opportunity of going there, either by embarking on board of a ship which was bound thither, or by being driven there at sea. In the latter case one of those perils at sea which he mentions (in 2 Cor. xi.) may then have taken place.

When he afterwards again quitted the continent of Asia, he went to Macedonia, returning by way of Troas, Acts xxi. from whence he sailed to Miletus. But in this voyage all places are so accurately described, that we know with certainty where he was, and that he went below Miletus more to the south, and came not at all in the neighbourhood of Crete, xx. 13—16. The only possibility of a visit to this island is therefore, when he went from Corinth to Ephesus by sea.

There are, besides, other circumstances connected with this voyage, which confirm this assertion. At the same time, that Paul arrived at Ephesus we find a certain Jew there called Apollos, who wished to go to Achaia, and for this purpose had obtained letters of recommendation from the brethren, Acts xviii.

24, 27. We likewise find in this epistle of the Apostle an Apollos who is travelling, and a recommendation to Titus to forward his journey, Tit. iii. 13.

If this be the same Apollos, who is mentioned in the Acts, as all the circumstances indicate, we then also perceive from his example, that the indirect course of vessels from Ephesus to Corinth, or on the contrary by way of Crete was not uncommon, whether it was occasioned by commercial transactions, or by other causes.

There remains, however, still a great doubt against the concurrent reference of the Acts of the Apostle and the Epistle of Titus to the same fact, in the journey to Apollos. The Acts of the Apostles conclude the residence of Paul at Ephesus with these words: he took leave, went to Palestine, and wandered through Galatia and Phrygia, confirming the brethren in the faith, xviii. 21, 22, 23. Here, for the first time, they mention Apollos, who consequently arrived after Paul, who had not seen him, and much less had received recommendations from him. So it appears; but if we compare that which the Acts of the Apostles afterwards say, it again appears to be otherwise. It happened (these are the words) while Apollos was at Corinth, that Paul, having passed through the upper countries, came to Ephesus, xix. 1. What induces the historian to return again to Apollos, and where he intends to speak of Paul to begin with Apollos? It is evident, that he wishes by this collation of it with Apollos' subsequent arrival at Corinth, to determine more accurately the period of the Apostle passing through the upper countries, and of his visiting Ephesus the second time. The sense of the words, however, is not so determinate: διελθοντα τα ἀνωτερικα μερη ἐλθειν εἰς Ἐφεσον. May they be said to mean μετα το διελθειν—ἠλθεν: after he had

passed through them, he came to Ephesus? He ought in this case to have expressed himself thus: διεληλυθοτα—ἐλθειν; in this manner μετα would indicate the preterpluperfect in the sentence. But as, on the contrary, he says, διελθοντα—ἐλθειν, it only signifies διηλθεν και ἠλθεν; both of them are one transaction, which are comprised in one period, and are not so distinct as to time, that a longer space can be presumed to have elapsed between the one than between the other. The sense is therefore this: WHILST APOLLOS WAS AT CORINTH, PAUL PASSED THROUGH THE UPPER COUNTRIES, AND ARRIVED AT EPHESUS. If, now, this journey was performed, when Apollos was already at Corinth, then the departure of Apollos for Corinth, and that of Paul for Syria, must have taken place nearly at the same time. But what follows? They must therefore have met each other at Ephesus, from whence both departed; the one to Corinth, and the other to Syria.

It will now be inquired, how the passage in Titus iii. 12. can be reconciled with this assertion? I think more simply and naturally than is generally the case. Paul thus writes to Titus: when I shall send to thee Tychicus (a man from the province in Asia, in the capital of which Paul wrote the Epistle, Acts xx. 4., and who probably went with him to Jerusalem); when I shall send Tychicus to thee, do thou hasten to Nicopolis; for I have determined to winter there. The Apostle went from Ephesus to the feast at Jerusalem: from thence he proceeded to Antioch, and then, after some time, he travelled through Upper Asia, Galatia, and Phyrgia, back again to Ephesus. The winter was consequently spent some where in Asia Minor. Now there is, as it is well known, a Nicopolis between Antioch and Tarsus, the native place of the

Apostle [q]. In this Nicopolis he was between two cities, which were dear to him, and it was situated on the road to the upper provinces. From Antioch he was in either case obliged to go through the Cilician ports to this Nicopolis, or near them, when he entered upon this journey. Now Titus knew from the course which the Apostle had taken, which city was intended among the many of this name; this Nicopolis was even better known to him than any other, since he was an Asiatic by birth. He was at least Paul's disciple, γνησιον τεκνον, Tit. i. 4, and connected with the Apostle, before he had yet seen Europe, Gal. ii. 1—6.

SECTION XCI.

It was at Crete where Titus was to bring to perfection the first endeavours of the Apostle; a difficult business among so demoralized a nation. Of all the virtues, which Paul in his instruction to Titus, requires from the ministers of the Church, the whole nation was destitute, and to all the faults, which he censures, the Cretans were addicted in general. The composition has a strong local reference, and might be explained and confirmed almost in each individual sentence, from classical authors. We shall here only notice in general terms the stronger lineaments of this nation.

Nature had endowed this island with all that ren-

[q] Strabo L. xiv. p. 465. Edit. Casaub. fol. 1587. This is the Nicopolis in the συνεκδημος of Hierocles, p. 660. respecting which Wesseling was embarrassed. Vet. Rom. Itinerar. Amstelod. 1735. Steph. Byzant V. Ἰσσος, πολις μεταξυ Συριας και Κιλικιας, ἐφ' ᾗ Ἀλεξανδρος Δαρειον ἐνικησε, ἡ ἐκληθη δια τουτο Νικοπολις ὑπ' αὐτου. Eustath. παρεκβολ. in Dionys. Perieges. v. 119.

ders man happy; the inhabitants, likewise, had formerly a constitution which was renowned, and frequently compared with that of the Spartans; but at this time and even long before, all, even laws and morals, had sunk very low.

The character of this nation was mutable, prone to quarrelling, to civil disturbances and frays, to robberies and violences[r]. Avaricious and base to a degree of sordid greediness, they considered nothing as ignoble which gratified this inclination[s]. Thence arose their treachery, their false and deceitful disposition, which had passed into a common proverb[t]. Even in the times of purer morals they were decidedly addicted to wine[u]; and their propensity to incontinence was frequently censured and noticed by the ancients.

της ἁπαντ' ἐχουσης
Κρητης, ὁπου πολεσσιν
ἑρως ἐποργιαζει . . . .

Religion itself was one cause of the many excesses of this nation. Many Deities were born among them: they also showed their tombs and catacombs and celebrated the feasts and mysteries of all. They, therefore, had continually holydays, diversions, and idle times, and one of their native

[r] Polyb. L. vi. 46. δια την ἐμφυτον σφισι πλεονεξιαν ἐν πλειστοις ἰδια και κατα κοινον στασεσι και φονοις και πολεμοις ἐμφυλιοις ἀναστρεφομενοι.

[s] Loc. cit. καθολου δ' ὁ περι την αἰσχροκερδιαν και πλεονεξιαν τροπος . . . . . ἐπιχωριαζει παρ' αὐτοις.

[t] Προς Κρηθα κρηθιζειν. Suidas. Plutarch. in Æmil. Paul. T. i. 488. Henr. Steph. Polyb. viii. 21. and 18. Κρης ὑπαρχων και φυσει ποικιλος. Zenodot. Proverb. v. κρητιζειν.

[u] They even regarded την ἐν τοις οἰνοις πολλην διατριβην, as an excellence in their constitution. Plato de Leg. L. i., v. viii., p. 38. Bipont.

poets, (Diodorus calls him Θεολογος), gave them the testimony, which Paul found to be so true, i. 12.

Jews also had established themselves among them *, who according to all appearance could have improved here but very little in morality. The Apostle seems to have considered them a more dangerous people, than the inhabitants themselves.

SECTION XCII.

Such was the state, such were the circumstances under which Titus was to establish institutions for a Christian school. In this difficult office, nothing could be more acceptable to this young teacher who was left to himself, than precepts and directions of conduct from his more enlightened guide. Paul in this Epistle sent them to him; but we can only notice them in their outlines. In the first place he points out to him the qualities which the superintendents of the Church should possess, the failings, from which they should be free, and which they mostly should labour to oppose, i. 11. Then follow the virtues required from the principal women, and the female sex in general, also the instruction which should be given to domestics. But he likewise admonishes him to shew himself as an example, and to inculcate a general change of mind into the adherents to Jesus, iii. To preach obedience, temperance, meekness, to avoid all verbal disputes and unprofitable speculations. Finally he recommends travellers to him, and appoints Nicopolis as a place of meeting.

* Philo. Legat. ad Caium. Edit. Turneb. p. 725.

SECTION XCIII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

Paul wrote the Epistle to Titus at Ephesus, and went from thence to Syria and Palestine; he had however promised to return to Ephesus which he performed. At that time he returned by way of Galatia and Phrygia, and after this visit composed from urgent motives this address to the faithful of Galatia, either when he was yet on the road, or, which is more probable, at Ephesus, Acts xviii. 33., in the 2nd year of Nero.

He had indeed already preached to them before, Acts xvi. 6., after he had assisted at the assembly of the Apostles and Presbyters at Jerusalem and again returned among the Gentiles. The precept, in which he had proposed to himself to instruct them, was the statute, which was there decided by them, about the question relative to Judaism, Acts xvi. 4. 6. It indeed released the Heathens from the observance of the law, but in consideration of the Jews did not pronounce its abolition or inability, nay, even indulgently conceded priority to the preachers of Moses, xv. 20, 21. In this spirit Paul preached among the Galatians, and met with approbation, so that even the Jews, who lived among them, raised no obstacles to him. As yet, peace prevailed, and the Epistle was not composed after this visit.

It was consequently composed after the latter, *i. e.* after the second visit, when he went to Ephesus by way of Galatia and Phrygia. For he speaks in the Epistle, as if a second and later visit had taken

place; since he distinctly mentions a former and preceding one in the words εὐηγγελισαμην ὑμιν το προτερον. Galat. iv. 13., which can only be so mentioned in reference to a later one. Of this first and the instruction imparted in it he says, that in it he has allowed for human frailty, δι' ἀσθενειαν της σαρκος εὐηγγελισαμην, for the sake of not giving offence by severer doctrines. He then makes an opposition between an instruction, in which he had told to them the plain truth without any consideration, and contrasts the two sorts of effects of both modes of teaching. For, they had received his consideration with cordiality, but when he told them the truth without reservation, they became hostilely inclined towards him on account of it, iv. 16., ὡστε ἐχθρος ὑμων γεγονα, ἀληθευων ὑμιν.

The Epistle can, from these criteria, only have been written after the second visit, but it was composed soon after it, because this alteration in their opinions, ταχεως, soon afterwards took place, i. 6 [y].

[y] Dr. Koppe, Nov. Test. perpet. adnot. illust. Vol. vi. ed. Tychsen, p. 8, 9., wished to include a previous journey to Galatia besides those mentioned in Acts xvi. 6. and xviii. 22. The Data for it are as follow. In the first place, Barnabas was known to the Galatians, Gal. ii. 13.; but he was not known to them either in Acts xvi. 6. or xviii. 23.; for he had just before, Acts xv. 36—39., separated himself from Paul, this acquaintance must therefore have been made much earlier. Secondly, the first journey of Paul to Galatia, expressly noticed in the Acts, xvi. 6., was undertaken for the purpose of strengthening the brethren in the faith, xv. 36. 46., which presupposes, that the Galatians had already received some instruction. This then might have occurred in the previous journey to Asia Minor, when Paul and Barnabas preached at Lystra and Derbe and in the ENVIRONS εἰς την περιχωρον, xvi. 6.

But was it necessary, that the Galatians should personally and by sight know all those whom Paul in his Epistle assumes to be known to them, as James, Cephas and John? But the design of strengthening the brethren did not exclude attempts at new conversions; they

SECTION XCIV.

THE inhabitants of Galatia or Gallogræcia, are a nation nearly related to us. Two Gaulish tribes, the TROCMI and TOLISTOBOII, as the Romans and Greeks, in a distorted and mutilated manner called them in their language, and a Celtic race, the TECTOSAGES, in other respects, as their neighbour Strabo assures us [a], perfectly alike among themselves in language and manners, upwards of two centuries and a half before the Christian era had conquered that part of Asia, which was called by them Galatia and Gallogræcia.

Jerome makes the peculiarly striking observation concerning their language, that they spoke a tongue which in his days was spoken in the country of Trier [b]. If this be the case, they must have been of German race and origin: for already long before Jerome the Germans were in possession of the countries on the Mosella, and the Treviri were so

were also desirous of visiting Bithynia and Asia on this journey, and they would have done so, had not the Spirit directed them backwards, xvi. 6, 7. Yet Luke distinctly separates the Galatians from those, whom it was proposed to strengthen. He begins xv. 40. by these; διηρχετο ... ἐπιστηριζων, and concludes xvi. 5. αἱ μεν ἐκκλησιαι ἐστερεουντο; then for the first time he begins respecting Phrygia and Galatia.

[a] Strabo, L. xii. p. 390.

[b] Hieron. Prolegom. in Epist. ad Galatas, L. ii. Unum est quod inferimus, ... Galatas, excepto Sermone Græco, quo omnis Oriens loquitur, propriam linguam eandem habere, quam Treviros, nec referre, si aliqua exinde corruperint, cum et Aphri Phœnicum linguam nonnullâ ex parte mutaverint.

proud of their Germanic extraction that they prided themselves upon it on any occasion, when any one would confound them with the Galli [b].

This Father had seen both the Galli and the Treviri, and soon after commenced his journey to Asia, in which he wandered through Phrygia and Galatia, and could draw a comparison of the language from a still fresh recollection of it.

The assertion of this teacher finds likewise farther confirmation in other data. Livy calls the chief of the horde, who on this march led the van to Asia, Lutarius [c]: which is manifestly a German name.

One at least of the three stocks must have been of German extraction, although Strabo makes them alike in language and customs. One of them also occurs elsewhere in history: namely the TECTOSAGES. These, the Volcæ Tectosages (as Cæsar calls them), perhaps [d] the nation of the Tectosages, had in ancient times, when the Galli were yet valiant, quitted the Gallic country and settled in the Hercynian forest, the beginning of which was with us, *in finibus Rauracorum*, where they are said to have adopted by degrees German manners and customs [e].

This happened, according to the narrative of another author, when Brennus conquered Rome with a Gaulish army:—the leader who conducted them in the Hercynian forest, was SIGOVESUS. The name of their chief is again so evidently German, that at their first settlement they could hardly have

[b] Taciti Germania, Sect. 28.

[c] Livius, L. xxxviii. c. 16.

[d] In the German—*Volk der Tektosager*. The analogy to *Volcæ* is apparent.—*Translator*.

[e] Julius Cæsar, Bell. Gall. L. vi. sect. 22. Beatus Rhenanus supposes them to be Würtembegians in the province of Teck.

been a foreign nation, which only gradually adopted the manners of our ancestors. But they did not remain there long.

About half a century afterwards and still later, a younger Brennus [f] took great numbers of these TECTOSAGES along with him to Thrace, to reinforce the horde in Asia. This expedition went from Gaul over the Rhine, along side of the Danube, apparently through Noricum, Pannonia and Mœsia and at their entry into Germany carried away with them a part of the Tectosages. When they arrived in Thrace, Lutarius took them with him, crossed the Bosphorus, and effected conquests in Asia.

But though I could pursue this investigation still farther, this were not the proper place for it: especially as the events and the Apostle's Epistle can expect no particular elucidation from it. In their new country they became acquainted with the Greek language and were called Gallogræci; they made use of it in public documents and inscriptions, of which we still possess remains.

They preserved, as it seems, their native religion, though they appear to have learned from the Phrygians the service of the MAGNA MATER DEÛM, and they likewise deviated from the custom of the Gallic and Germanic nations by having temples. Upon the whole there were few cities among them, except Ancyra, Tavium and Pessinus, the latter of which carried on some commerce, which probably attracted those circumcised fellow citizens, who, according to the account of Josephus, enjoyed here considerable liberties, the record of which was deposited in the temple of Augustus at Ancyra [g].

[f] Livius, L. xxxviii. c. 16.

[g] Joseph Archæol. L. xvi. c. 6.

Although the climate was such as to lower their courage and hardiness [h], nevertheless they did not become effeminate, and not long before the Christian æra they had so little declined from the simplicity of their manners, that a Roman orator particularly notices among the eulogies on their king, that he was a diligent planter and rearer of cattle [i].

Paul experienced the kindest reception and great applause from them. Acts xvi. 6., Gal. iv. 13. 14. But when he afterwards at another visit, Acts xviii. 22., shewed less indulgence to Judaism and declared himself more freely respecting its validity, ἀληθευων, Gal. iv. 16., those, who among the Jews resident here had embraced Christianity, scarcely awaited his departure, to protect the law and Moses with full vigour.

But it seems that some of the Judaizing Christians, who had lately arrived here from Jerusalem, were particularly active in this affair; for, the instigators of it extolled the heads of this Church, John, Peter, James, and themselves as their disciples, and drew disadvantageous parallels between Paul and them, and between their respective doctrines, the most evident traces of which appear in the Epistle. And the Jewish converts actually predominated, and persuaded the Galatians of the necessity of the whole of Judaism in the school of the Messiah. The Galatians allowed themselves to be circumcised, and acceded to the Jewish religion in its whole extent. And thus at once were all Paul's endeavours disturbed, his labours partly frustrated, and his hopes considerably baffled.

[h] Florus Hist. Rom. L. ii. c. 2. Liv. xxxvii. c. 8.

[i] Cicero pro. R. Dejotaro : diligentissimus agricola et pecuarius.

SECTION XCV.

He was soon apprised of this, and referred them to the principles of his last imparted instruction. If there should come not only a Jew from Jerusalem, if there should come an angel from heaven, to teach you any thing different to that which I have taught, believe him not, i. 10. I am not a disciple of men, appointed by Peter and James, but an Apostle taught and invested with full authority by God, not inferior to either of them: I have even remonstrated with Peter to his face, when he acted insincerely concerning Judaism, iii. 1. Have you received through Jesus Christ instruction only in the Jewish law, or have you received through him a more sublime, more spiritual and more powerful doctrine? Did Abraham himself receive the promise of the Messiah by the Law, which did not yet exist, or by faith? Has not the Law rather brought upon mankind the displeasure of God, from which Jesus has redeemed us?—iii. 23.

The Law is nothing but a preparation for Christianity, it was only a schoolmaster: but now we are released from its observance, we are perfect men and hereditary children of God—iv. 8. Still more; ye became free men through Christ, and now you have returned into a state of bondage. Christianity is the religion of independence, the Law is that of servitude, as the allegorical explanation of the history of Hagar and Sarah shows you—v. Consequently, Judaism is no longer adapted to Christians: exercise yourselves rather in morality and in ennobling your heart and spirit: be on your guard

against those who would calumniate me: subdue the pride and presumption of conceit; Christ alone must henceforth be your pride.

SECTION XCVI.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

CORINTH, a great commercial city, between two ports, the one of which insured a reception to the western navigator and the other to the eastern, was situated as it were in the centre of the civilized world, where the merchants of the three parts of the globe met and exchanged their treasures. It was formerly also celebrated for its Isthmian games, and for the Temple of Venus, in which a thousand priestesses of the Goddess ministered to dissoluteness under the patronage of religion[j]. From such numerous causes it had an influx of foreigners of all descriptions, who carried the riches and the vices of all nations into a city, in which the seaman, the merchant and the warrior could enjoy them for his money[k]. This city in consequence of having ill used the Roman Ambassadors, fell a prey to the Romans with all its treasures and works of art, and was totally destroyed by Mummius. After it had lain waste for a long time, it was rebuilt by Julius Cæsar, who peopled it with a Roman colony. It soon flourished again: three Cæsars endeavoured to augment its

[j] το τε της Ἀφροδιτης ἱερον οὑτω πλησιον ὑπηρξεν, ὡσπε πλειους ἡ χιλιας ἱεροδουλους ἑκεκτητο ἑταιρας, ἀς ἀνετιθεσαν τῃ Θεῳ και ἀνδρες και γυναικες. Και δια τουτο οὐν πολυωχλειτο ἡ πολις, και ἐπλουτιζετο. Strabo viii. p. 261.—Ed. 2da. Casauboni, p. 378.

[k] Strabo, L. xii. p. 385.

lustre and were occupied in the prodigious work of cutting through the Isthmus, and connecting the two harbours, to avoid the passage over Malæa.

The ancient manners abundantly returned; Acrocorinth was again the seat of the Isthmian Dione, and an intemperate life was commonly called a Corinthian mode of life [l]. Among all the cities that ever existed, this was accounted the most voluptuous [m], and the Satyrist could only jocularly seem to be at a loss, whether in this respect, he should give the preference to Corinth or to Athens [n].

In this city Paul wished to found a community of friends to virtue and Believers in Jesus. He came thither (as we have seen) on his first journey to Europe, and preached the kingdom of God first of all to the Jews; but they were here as untractable as at Thessalonica. He only succeeded in gaining some few over to his side, viz. two of their principals, Crispus and Sosthenes; but the *Metuentes*, (Heathens proselytized to Judaism), seriously joined him and seem in the sequel ever to have continued his faithful adherents, whilst the Jews, as they gradually increased, disturbed the plans of the Apostle. He remained here one year and six months; Timothy and Silas were his assistants, Acts xviii. 1—19.

When circumstances called him from hence, a great number soon after his departure returned to their ancient mode of life, frequented again the priestesses at Acrocorinth, or in general pursued their former habits. He wrote an Epistle to them

[l] Hesych. Lex. Κορινθιάζειν,—μαστροπευειν,—ἑταιρευειν.

[m] Dio. Chrys. Orat. Corinth. T. ii. p. 119. Reisk. καιτοι πολιν οἰκειτε των οὐσων τε και γεγενημενων ἐπαφροδιτοτατην, and p. 120. Πρωρα και πρυμνα της Ἑλλαδος, ὀλβιοι μεν και ἀφνειοι.

[n] Lucian, Amores.

on this subject, which is[o] lost, 1 Cor. v. 9—12., in which he interdicts the faithful from all intercourse with such corrupted persons.

SECTION XCVII.

Paul in the mean time had returned, as he had promised, from Jerusalem by Galatia and Phrygia, to Ephesus. Whilst he remained here, the Corinthians gave him a still more urgent occasion for instructing them. He wrote to them, in consequence, two Epistles, which are still extant.

The first of these is the only one of all Paul's treatises, of the origin of which we have an account, which is supported by perfectly sufficient evidence. In the days of Clemens Romanus the Corinthian Church was split into factions: he therefore reminded them of the first Epistle of the Apostle, and its occasion, as a similar instance. Even then, says he, Paul wrote to them, because under the name of this or that Apostle, of Cephas or Apollos, they had split themselves into parties[p].

History tells us no more. To form an idea of the condition of the Corinthian Church, we must examine the Epistles of the Apostle, and collect and arrange each separate date contained in them; with-

[o] See the note in § 98.

[p] Ἀναλαβετε την ἐπιστολην του μακαριου Παυλου· τι πρωτον ὑμιν ἐν ἀρχῃ του εὐαγγελιου ἐγραψεν; ἐπ' ἀληθειας πνευματικως ἐπεστειλεν ὑμιν, περι αὐτου τε και Κηφᾶ, και Ἀπολλω, δια το και τοτε προσκλισεις ὑμας πεποιησθαι· ἀλλ' ἡ προσκλισις ἐκεινη ἡττον ἁμαρτιαν προσηνεγκεν· προσεκλιθητε γαρ ἀποστολοις, και ἀνδρι δεδοκιμασμενῳ παρ' αὐτοις. Clem. 1. ad Cor. Ep. c. 4. et Hegesipp. apud Euseb. H. E. L. iii. c. 15.

out which preliminary step, it would be quite impossible to understand rightly these writings, and to comprehend them in all their parts [q]. These different factions, into which they were divided, exalted above all others the chiefs τους ὑπερ λιαν ἀποστολους, 2 Cor. xi. 5., xii. 11., whose notions they adopted, and whose doctrines they professed to follow, and attempted to depreciate those of the opposite party. Whilst then some called themselves disciples of Paul, Cephas, or Apollos, others assumed the splendid appellation of Christ's party. Probably they affected to be the followers of James, the brother of our Lord, and thought thus to enter into a nearer discipleship with Jesus than the other parties.

The controversy, as we shall see from the whole, related to the obligation of Judaism. The advocates of it had appealed, even in Galatia, to Cephas and James, for the sake of opposing to Paul, who had banished the Jewish ceremonies from Christianity, authorities which were not less admitted, than his own. The question itself divided all these various parties into two principal factions: the partizans of Cephas and James were for the Law;—the friends of Paul adopted his opinion, as well as Apollos, who with his adherents was always in heart in favour of Paul, and never wished to take a part in a separation from him. 1 Cor. xvi. 12.

The leaders of the party against Paul, these ψευδαποστολοι (as Paul calls them) and μετασχηματισμενοι εἰς Ἀποστολους Χριστου, who declared themselves the promulgators and defenders of the doctrines of Cephas and James, were, as may be easily conceived,

[q] I have here made use of a work which I consider the best on this subject. Storr Notitiæ histor. Epistolarum Pauli ad Corinth. Tübing. 1788. 4.

converted Jews, 2 Cor. xi. 22., who had come from different places,—to all appearance from Palestine (ἐρχομενοι, 2 Cor. xi. 4), and could therefore boast of having had intercourse with the Apostles at Jerusalem, and of an acquaintance with their principles. They were not even of the better sort of Jews, but those, who adhered to the doctrines of the Sadducees, and though they were even now converted to Christianity, whilst they spoke zealously in favour of the Law, they were undermining the hopes of the pious, and exciting doubts against the resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. 35. Cf. Matthew xxii. 23., so that Paul, from regard to the teachers, whose disciples they professed to be, was obliged to refute them from the testimony of James and Cephas, 1 Cor. xv. 5. 7.

These, proud of their own opinions, 1 Cor. i. 17., not without private views depreciated Paul's authority and extolled their own knowledge, 1 Cor. ii. 12., 2 Cor. xi. 16, 17.

Violently as the contest was carried on, they still did not withdraw from the same place of assembly for instruction and mutual edification; this, however, was even the cause of too many scandalous scenes and disorders [r].

[r] A great part of the disorders which Paul censures could not well have taken place, if they had withdrawn from the same place of assembly, which some would infer from the expressions: 1 Cor. i. 2. ἐν παντι τοπῳ αὐτῳ τε και ἡμων. The explanation which I gave of this passage displeased Bertholdt (Introduction, vith part, sect. 719. pa. 3331,) and justly so. But his own likewise does not satisfy me for several reasons, which I have not room here individually to discuss. There is perhaps less objection to the following. The Apostle wishes the Grace of God, and a peaceful Spirit to be with the members of the Church at Corinth: ἐν παντι τοπῳ, every where, wherever they may be: ἐν τοπῳ αὐτων, at Corinth and in its neighbourhood, or ἐν τοπῳ ἡμων, that is, with me. For besides those, who were seceding xv. 17., there were many with Paul: Sosthenes i. 1., Apollos

At the ἀγαπαι, love and benevolence were no where to be seen. Instead of eating together, and refreshing their poor brethren out of that which they had brought with them, each one, as he came, ate his own, without waiting for any one else, and feasted often to excess, whilst the needy was fasting, 1 Cor. xi. 17.

When also some were preparing for prayers or singing, others raised their voices to instruct, and commenced exercises in *spiritual gifts* (in γλωσσαις [s]

xvi. 12., perhaps those of Chloe i. 11. and others. For the ἀδελφοι, xvi. 20., to whom greetings occur in xvi. 18, 19., were neither Asiatics nor Ephesians; consequently, they were most probably Corinthians, who had quitted the scene of these disturbances, and repaired to Paul.

Hug's explanation of ἐν τοπῳ αὐτων and ἐν τοπῳ ἡμων, is forced and unwarranted by any corresponding passage in the New Testament. The interpretation, which our English translators have given, is the most obvious, and the best supported by the structure of the verse. The Eastern versions are not fully decisive: although, if they were favourable to Hug, the pronouns would be suffixed,—the Syriac would have been ܒܕܘܟܬܗ ܕܡܪܢ ܒܕܘܟܬܗ ܕܟܠܗ, and so with the rest: ܒܟܠ ܐܬܪ ܕ, therefore must refer to ܡܪܢ *of our Lord*:—consequently, as they now stand, the Syriac version supports the received interpretation;—the Arabic and Æthiopic seem to accept the words as implying the Grace of God be with them and us. It is however evident, that if Hug be correct, αὐτων τε και ἡμων are superfluous and redundant, because the whole sense, for which he contends, is comprized in παντι τοπῳ: if they be not redundant, our English version alone can be right.—*Translator.*

[s] Although a great dispute has been agitated respecting το λαλειν γλωσσαις, it is perfectly explained by the subject of the three chapters, which Hug has cited, and completely set at rest by the 18th verse of ch. xiv., which restricts it to the power of speaking foreign tongues, from which it has been absurdly distorted. Storr renders the verse, "ich danke meinem Gott, weil (oder dass) ich ein höheres maass der Sprachgabe habe, als ihr alle:" and so the Æthiopic Translator understood it, when he added "*tongues of foreign coun-*

λαλειν, or προφητεια, ἑρμηνεια, concerning the nature and properties of which so much controversy has been excited of late years), 1 Cor. xii. xiii. xiv.; moreover the women, to bring confusion to its highest pitch, took their part in interlocutions and proposals of questions, 1 Cor. xiv. 34.

Such was the state of things, as to the interior discipline of the assemblies and edification; but the exterior deportment, which the members of this society had maintained in civil life, soon disappeared also. Formerly, when differences arose among the Believers, they were adjusted by the intervention of

tries," (*in loco*). The promise, which had been made to the Apostles, was λαλειν ἐν ἑτεραις γλωσσαις (Acts ii. 4. collat. cum. 17.), which property was afterwards transferred by them to other Believers. Cf. Acts xix. 6, &c. It is therefore not improbable, that in the state of the Corinthian community, some, who were acquainted with several tongues may have abused this knowledge, and ascribing it to that Higher source, from whence the Apostles received it, have thence taken occasion to disturb the devotional services. Ἑρμηνεια, as it occurs in this Epistle, seems to refer exclusively to the interpretation of tongues: cf. xiv. 27.

But the most difficult part of the inquiry is the προφητεια of the epistolary part of the New Testament. In one instance in the LXX. we observe נקן translated προφητης, although some MSS. indeed retain the word πρεσβυς; Schleusner has collected several pertinent examples, in which the title is equivalent to ἐξηγητης. In Matthew x. 41., and other places it appears synonymous to מלאך, of which we have also an example in the LXX.; and both the Hebrew Bible and New Testament furnish copious instances, in which it is applied to the composer of sacred rhapsodies, thus, Miriam is styled נביאה —προφῆτις,—hence, Kimchi on 1 Sam. x. 5. interprets הִתְנַבְּאוּ *to sing these productions*. But, in this Epistle the word appears more particularly to have relation to a scrutiny of the ancient prophecies respecting the Messiah, and to the interpretation and application of them to Jesus in the religious Assemblies, the Kámús also in the xth conj. of בין renders the word to inquire or scrutinize, which is a collateral authority: from all of which we infer ἑρμηνεια to have been ἑρμηνεια γλωσσῶν, and προφητεια in its restricted sense to have been διερμηνευσις μαντεων.—*Translator.*

arbitrators from their own communion, and terminated quietly. Now, as their mutual confidence in each other more and more decreased, they brought, to the disgrace of Christianity, their complaints before the Pagan tribunals, 1 Cor. vi. 1.

But as to what concerned the main object, viz. the obligation of Judaism, it was so little confined simply to words and reasons, that each party rather strove to display its opposite principles in its conduct. One party gave to the other, as much as possible, motives for ill-will and reproach. The Jews required circumcision, as an indispensable act of religion; whilst Paul's disciples attempted to [t] lay the foundation of a new doctrine respecting it, and to extinguish all traces of circumcision, 1 Cor. vii. 18.

As the Jewish party observed and maintained a distinction of meats, that of Paul ate without distinction any thing sold in the markets, and even meats from the heathen sacrifices, 1 Cor. x. 25. 28., viii. 1.

Nor was this enough; they made no scruple to be present at the sacrificial feasts. Among other things, they also took part in many scandalous practices which took place there, and fell, by means of their improvidence, into still greater crimes, 1 Cor. x. 20, 21., viii. 10 [u].

According to the Jewish custom, the women were

[t] Hug's words, which are here paraphrased, are, die Paulinischen aber machten versuche *sich eine neue vorhaut zu pflanzen.*

[u] Leydekker, vii. 66. supposes here Paul's allusion to have been לשעירים ולעגלים (2 Chron. xi. 15.) which Jeroboam set up, but as conterparts to them existed in every Pagan country, we have no occasion to force his words to such an allusion. We, however, observe, that in Horayoth f. ii. 1. the מורה or Apostate, is said to eat food interdicted by the law, and to drink the wine of libation, שתה יין נסך, by which a participation of heathen sacrifices is implied. But, St. Paul seems to have referred to an actual participation.—*Transl.*

obliged to appear veiled in the synagogues and public assemblies. The Anti-judaists abolished this custom of the synagogue, 1 Cor. xi. 5, 6. 10 [x]; and herein resembled the heathen practices.

[x] Having already copiously discussed this subject, in the 53d No. of the Classical Journal, I shall here confine myself to some few additional remarks. Hug is totally incorrect in his assertion, that the absence of the veil induced a resemblance to Pagan customs: so far was it the contrary, that Valerius Maximus xvii. iii. 10. states Caius Sulpicius Gallus to have repudiated his wife, because he met her abroad without her veil. The Roman Priests were never without it at sacrifices, and Plutarch says, (Quæst. Rom.) οἱ Ῥωμαιοι τῶν ἀνθρωπων τοις ἀξιοις ἀπατῶντες κἀν τυχωσι, ἐπι της κεφαλης το ἱματιον ἐχοντες ἀποκαλυπτονται. Suetonius records Julius Cæsar to have observed this custom, when he was dying. Plutarch says, that Pompey sat down at a feast ἐχων δι' ὠτων κατα της κεφαλης το ἱματιον. Every Eastern nation was scrupulous about the women's veils: the Gabrs, and others, like the Romans, used veils in their sacred offerings. The Turks call the veil, which conceals the woman's entire person فرجي, and that which covers the face and not the eyes, يچمق and to rend or take away the veil, is in Arabic idiom equivalent to violation. We are well informed that the Persian women do not take off the چادر when they pray, and that the custom mentioned by Eustathius in Dionys. de situ orbis, of their loosening the band of their head when they salute, no longer prevails, being exchanged for an inclination of the body, and placing the hand to the heart. It is doubtful whether Eustathius's account ever had any truth. Some have supposed the tiaras of their Priests to have been the same as the מצנפת of the Hebrew Priests: Strabo calls them τοιλωτας καθηκουσας ἑκατερωθεν. The universality of the practice is manifest from the Greek writers as well as from the Asiatic, and there are so many laws respecting it in the Old Testament, that we can scarcely hesitate respecting the Apostle's meaning. In Ketuboth f. 72. 1. women unveiling are required to be divorced by their husbands, and sent away without a dowry (cf. Numb. v. 18). An unveiled woman is said (in Aboth. c. 35.) to be a disgrace to her family. St. Paul therefore in the use of ἐξουσια is warranted by Hebrew opinions and phraseology. Virgins were called עלמות, from the veil which they wore, which was removed after their nuptials, and replaced by one which denoted the husband's *authority*. *Leydekker.* 1 vol. 91. Isi-

From despite to Judaism, which considered matrimonial offspring as a particular blessing of God, some embraced celibacy; which they justified by Paul's example, 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8., and this they also recommended to others, 1 Cor.vii. 1—25. Some went even so far, that, although married, they resolved to practise a continual continency, 1 Cor. vii. 3—5.

We are not so well informed, in what way the advocates of Judaism in their zeal for giving offence to the others went astray, if we except a single case, in which they far exceeded every thing. They even countenanced the Jewish casuistical indulgences towards proselytes, and permitted (a charge of which Paul's party is acquitted, 2 Cor. ii. 2.) a Gentile, who was disposed to adopt Judaism in the Christian schools, to marry his step-mother. For whosoever embraced Judaism was considered as a new-born child according to the ancient doctrines, גר שנתגייר כקטן שנולד, and all his preceding connexions were considered as not existing. His mother, father, brothers, and sisters, no more belonged to him[y]. In this

dore (Off. Eccl. 9.) states that brides were married veiled, to shew the *power* of their husbands; and Tertullian (De Virg. Vel.) writes, "ipsæ enim sunt, quas *subjectas* esse oportet, propter quas *potestas* suprà caput haberi debet. *Velamen jugum* illorum est." Hence, in Aboth. c. 16, רשות is used as Paul has used ἐξουσια, where Rabbi Eliezer is affirmed to have taken away the רשות (ἐξουσιαν—*velum*) from his sister's daughter. רדיך, however, is the term commonly referred to it.

Lightfoot declares, that the women unveiled in the religious assemblies their heads as far as the hair, and long hair is mentioned as a woman's chief ornament in Erubhin f. 100. 2. To this St. Paul alludes. He is likewise warranted by the LXX in the use of δοξα, at ver. 7., where it expresses תמונה, and a variety of other senses. Phavorinus also interprets it εικασμος.—*Translator.*

[y] Jo. Selden de successionibus ad Leges Hebræorum c. 26. pr. 191. Elzevir, 1638.

case, his former connections were not considered in marriage; this misconduct therefore took place according to established principles.

SECTION XCVIII.

Chloe, a believer at Corinth, gave to the Apostle the first account of these dissensions, 1 Cor. i. 11. Some part he had heard from others, ἀκουεται, 1 Cor. v. 9. At length the Corinthians themselves sent a mission, among whom (as it appears) were Apollos and Sosthenes, 1 Cor. i. 1., xvi. 12., with an Epistle to the Apostle. He not only answered this, but also took notice of the accounts, which he had before received. When he wrote his answer, he was still at Ephesus, where he intended to remain till Pentecost, xvi. 8. It was consequently written at the latter part of his abode in that city, in the beginning of the 4th year of Nero. They probably had [z] received the

[z] The hypothesis of a preceding Epistle, which is noticed in § 97., is not sufficiently substantiated to become the basis of an argument. Its only foundation seems to be ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῃ ἐπιστολῃ contrasted with νῦνι δε ἐγραψα ὑμιν, in the 11th verse. But it is evident from the nature of all the Semitic dialects, the idiom of which St. Paul continually transferred into the Greek, that ἐγραψα may be equivalent to γραφω. The 11th verse is an adequate example of this, where νυνι restricts the time to the present: thus, the Syriac is ܟܬܒ, which a Grecian might render γεγραφα, ἐγραψα, ἐγραφον, or γραφω. Bertholdt and others, infer from this and a passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, the loss of many of the Apostle's Epistles, yet with no solidity of argument. Had Paul alluded to a former Epistle, he would not have indefinitely written, ἐν τῃ ἐπιστολῃ, but rather ἐν τῃ προτερᾳ ἐπιστολῃ;—ἐν τῃ ἐπιστολῃ, therefore appears analogous to ἐν ταυτῃ τῃ ἐπιστολῃ, whence the passage is equivalent to γραφω ὑμῖν ἐν ταυτῃ τῃ ἐπιστολῃ—κ'.τ'.λ'. for the eleventh verse, νυνι δε—κ'.τ'.λ'. has an evident reference to the modification, which he has introduced

Epistle concerning the Passover, to which the passage in 1 Cor. v. 7, 8. alludes, and is beautifully devised.

But we are not allowed undisputed possession of this passage, which affords to us so good a computation of time. They say, is not an allegory of the Apostle entirely misunderstood, which pourtrays the duty of being irreproachable, and worshipping God in piety and virtue? Certainly, if the words were merely;—"know ye not that a little leaven leavens the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven;" the metaphor would not trangress its general acceptation, any more than in Gal. v. 9., and might very well be an allusion to purity in general. But the Apostle here contracts the circle of metaphors, and returns to the feast of the passover; for Christ is the passover, which is slain for us. How then does Paul happen to choose the metaphor of the passover at this excommunication, if it had not taken place about this time? If it had occurred at Whitsuntide or on any other day the metaphor would neither have had an occasion nor a purport. Then, Paul continues, ὥστε ἑορταζωμεν, *let us not keep the feast with the old leaven*, &c. Ἑορταζειν in this passage does not admit of the meaning of piously serving God; it does not treat of the change of mind of Believers, nor of embracing a more virtuous life; but of purifying the society by the expulsion of an unworthy member. The proposed general interpretation therefore lies far beyond the real view of the author, and we are referred to the particular; "that ye may celebrate

in the tenth, και οὐ παντως—κ'. τ'. λ'. νῦν being "*argumentandi et transeundi particula*," of which examples from the New Testament will be found in Schleusner. Thus, St. John (Ep. i. c. 2. ver. 12, 13, 14.) says, indifferently, γραφω ὑμῖν and ἐγραψα ὑμῖν.—*Translator.*

the feast as a purified society free from the alloy of any impure and vicious participant."

Paul, it appears, gave the epistle to some of the society who were returning home, viz. to Stephanus, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, xvi. 15—19., to be delivered by them, whilst Apollos and Sosthenes remained for the present at Ephesus, xvi. 12. cf. i. 1. For it was not only proper but necessary, to deliver to the deputies the result of the mission which they had performed, that they might be able to transfer it to those who had sent them.

At the same time (as may easily be imagined) Timothy travelled with them, as the deputy, on the part of the Apostle, for so the dignity of the Ecclesiastical administration required, Acts xv. 27. It was his office to invigorate the effect of the Epistle by his own discourses, and where doubts still existed, to elucidate and dispel them from the Apostle's doctrines. Thus far is his duty declared in the Epistle, iv. 16, 17.

We may conclude, when Timothy commenced his journey from his being expected back at Ephesus by the Pentecost, xvi. 8—12. According to this order, he was to set out at the end of the winter, as soon as it was practicable. If he performed the whole journey by sea, he might embark about the vernal equinox, for the seamen commenced their most important undertakings at the *æquinoctium vernum*[a]. The number of days from Ephesus to Athens we may learn from a journey of Cicero, which was rather tedious. He had left Ephesus on the 1st of October, and arrived at Athens on the 14th[b], his brother Quintus performed the same

[a] Liv. L. xxxvii. c. 9.

[b] Cic. ad Attic. Ep. L. vi. ep. 8, 9.

journey in the same space of time [c]. If we adopt this as a standard, and allowing a couple of days for the journey from Athens to Corinth, Timothy arrived in the first week of April.

But if he found it more advisable to make the journey by land to Troas and thence through Macedonia for the sake of shortening the voyage by sea, we know that the distance from Amphissa to Amphipolis has been performed in six days with unusual expedition [d]. Although Timothy could not have wanted assistance and means of expedition in the Churches of Macedonia, we would not exact any thing extraordinary from him, and for the sake of proceeding more securely, would compile the journey to Europe from two roads, which are to be found in the celebrated itinerary. The first is from Athens to Thessalonica [e]. From Athens to Oropus there are thirteen Roman miles; from thence to Thebes, forty-four—to Chalcis, thirty-six—to Opus, twenty-four—to Demetrias, forty-eight—to Larissa, fourteen—to Dios, forty-four—to Berœa, twenty-four—to Thessalonica, seventeen—together 264. The other road goes from Thessalonica to Neapolis [f]. From Thessalonica to Mellisurgis, twenty-seven—thence to Apollonia, twenty—to Amphipolis, seventeen—to Philippi, thirty—to Neapolis, thirty-three—together 127. Both roads amount together to 391 Roman miles. The number of miles reduced to German miles, five of which according to the usual computation being admitted into one German mile, make seventy-

[c] Cic. ad Attic. Ep. L. III. ep. 9. where Valde fuit ei properandum must be referred to the following, ne quid absens, etc.

[d] Liv. L. XXXVII. c. 17. and L. XLIV. c. 45.

[e] Vet. Roman. itineraria; sive Antonini itinerarium, etc. edit. Wesseling, p. 326—8.

[f] P. 320—21.

eight of our miles; 156 hours, or from fifteen to sixteen days' journey. If we add two days for the journey from Athens to Corinth, and four days of rest, they amount to twenty-two days. If we take for the passage from Troas according to Acts xx. 6., five days; although on another occasion Paul, Acts xvi. 11. appears to have performed this journey in two days, and from Troas to Ephesus, as much as Paul required to Miletus, *i. e.* four days; thus the whole journey amounts to thirty-one days. If now he left Ephesus at the beginning of March, he was at Corinth in the first week of April. Whatever way then he chose, he reached the place of his destination, before the feast of the passover.

SECTION XCIX.

The Epistle treats for the most part of the faults of St. Paul's adherents, and seems to be addressed almost exclusively to them; they too had written to the Apostle, and acknowledged his authority. He was therefore almost entirely occupied with the faults of the Anti-Judaic party, and those of the Judaizing party have remained almost unnoticed.

The Epistle has three divisions. The first treats of his information from the messages of Chloe; the other, of that which he had heard from other sources, and the last of that which had been written to him.

In consequence of the account given by Chloe, i. 11. he exhorts them to unity, and thanks God, that he himself has given to them no inducement for divisions. He assures them, that although he has preached without eloquence and parade of learn-

ing, he certainly published the pure truth of God. Besides, it is indifferent, whether it be Paul or Apollos, which is likewise applicable to other chiefs of parties—all are but servants of God and of the Gospel, every one of whom will receive the reward according to his merits; and if a preference is due to any one, it rather belongs to the first messengers of the faith, than to the subsequent teachers.

As to that which he had learned from other accounts, v. 1. he commands them not to tolerate the abominable incest, he delivers[6] up the transgressor to Satan, v. 5. They are to shun the unclean and immoral person in the community, they are never to bring their disputes before the heathen tribunals, vi. 11., and to behave themselves in a manner worthy of the portion, which they have in Christ, vii. 1.

But as to the Epistle, he replied, vii. 1., that he could not approve of the continence of married persons, neither that one party under pretext of unbelief should separate from the other. Single per-

[6] It is difficult to determine precisely, what is implied by παραδοῦναι τον τοιοῦτον τῷ Σατανᾷ. it was probably the severest degree of excommunication from the religious assemblies, and from intercourse with the Believers. It has been imagined to have been that degree of חֵרֶם, which the Rabbinical writers denominate שַׁמָּתָא, which is not only excommunication, but absolute execration: so direful indeed was it accounted, that Rabbi Asher, f. 180. 2. enjoined, that it should only be pronounced in punishment of the most heinous crimes; אין משמתינן אלא על דבר חמור. It was certainly of ancient date, because it occurs in the Targumin, and seems to have been that intended by Paul, because it was in the power of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Functionaries to release the penitent trangressor from it. So did Paul in this instance. It was a severer and more execrating נידוי. With one so excommunicated it was not lawful to eat or drink, thus, the Apostle says in this chapter, τῷ τοιοῦτῳ μηδε συνεσθιειν. If the etymology of שמתא be שם אתא (as many have asserted) which is most probable, such likewise was the *Anathema*, which on another occasion he calls MARAN-ATHA.—*Translator.*

sons, who are not endowed with continence, should marry, vii. 18. The circumcised should not have recourse to subtleties to enforce circumcision, and every one should be contented with his condition. vii. 25.

His advice to the single is, to remain single, not because it is a sin to marry; on the contrary it is even good; but times will come, when it might have been desirable to have remained independent and single, for the sake of not being drawn by connections into infidelity against religion, viii.

They are, however, right in affirming an idol to be nothing, and in allowing no distinction between meats offered to idols and others: but if the weaker brother stumble at it, his weakness should be spared, and much less should they be present at the offerings in the Temples, ix. 3.

The Apostle then diverges into an episode, and assures them of the purity of his views and doctrines, by appealing to his disinterestedness, which fully acquits him of any advantage or private views, affirming his reward and recompence, to be—God and Christ—ix. 27.

He then again passes over to idolatry, draws their attention to the example of the Fathers, and to the incompatibility of idolatry with Christianity, x. 23., and recommends anew a careful forbearance towards the weaker brethren, xi.

For the credit of the external worship of God, he reminds them, that the women in the assemblies should be veiled and keep silence, xi. 17.

That the Sacrament is a remembrance of the death of Jesus; that therefore each person should partake of it with a mind void of offence, xi. 17. xii.

That each should so use the spiritual gifts, that they may serve for the edification of all; for that they

are on no account for individuals, but for the advantage of all. All constitute but one body, of which each is a member, which must work for the benefit of the whole. But these gifts are absolutely nothing in comparison with the law of love and peace—xiv.

In regard to the resurrection he has sufficiently informed them, that Jesus has arisen, that he has appeared to James and Cephas, and to more than 500 brethren, and lastly, to himself, and that Jesus will awaken all to glory or to dishonor, according to each individual's merits, xvi. Finally, he invites them to make among themselves a charitable collection for the poor brethren in Palestine.

SECTION C.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

Paul remained yet some time at Ephesus, but sent before him Timothy and Erastus through Macedonia, Acts xix. 22. to Corinth, 1 Cor. xvi. 10. Thither he sent also Titus, who was commissioned to observe what impression and effect the Apostle's Epistle would produce: or to make to the Apostle a report, so as to determine his future measures, 2 Cor. ii. 12. vii. 6—16. Also, to set on foot the collection for the poor, viii. 6. When Paul quitted Ephesus to go to Macedonia and Achaia, he expected Titus already to have returned to Troas, 2 Cor. ii. 12., but he first met him in Macedonia, vii. 5., and received from him the joyful intelligence of the good success of his Epistle and precautions, vii. 7, 8, 9.

But they were mostly of Paul's party, who appeared penitent, submissive and ready for improvement; the Jewish party sought, on the contrary, in his

Epistle merely materials for a new attack on his character.

The Apostle had, at different times, and particularly in this Epistle, promised to come to them, 1 Cor. v. 19, 20, xvi. 4. but he had not as yet fulfilled that promise. They upbraided him therefore for his variableness and unsteady disposition, and took occasion from thence to raise suspicions against his doctrines, 2 Cor. i. 15.—ii. and to charge him with obscurity and vagueness in his instructions, iv. 7.

As the Epistle was full of earnestness, severity, and energy, they contrasted it with his conduct in other respects, and remarked on it, that he might well have courage to speak thus at a distance, where none faced him; but that otherwise he was much more docile, and confined himself to a more complying tone, 2 Cor. x. 9, 10.

Paul, to prove the disinterested integrity of his doctrines, principles, and assertions, had reminded the Corinthians, that he had never sought his own advantage, that he had even refused his well-earned reward, that he had devoted himself to the toil of instruction, to danger and persecution, merely from duty and for the sake of Jesus, 1 Cor. ix. 10. This was indeed a decisive argument, which his adversaries could not allow to exist in its full force. They appear, therefore, for the purpose of weakening it, to have renounced likewise all pay or recompence, that, in this respect, they might be on a par with the Apostle, 2 Cor. xi. 12, 13, 14. In this respect, however, the collections for the poor furnished them with a pretext to attack his disinterestedness; especially the collection desired in his Epistle, which Titus was then levying. They said, that in this way he plundered one church, that for a while he might appear disinterested in the others. 2 Cor. xi. 7. xii. 15—17.

SECTION CI.

He learned all this from Titus, whom he met in Macedonia, 2 Cor. vii. 5. To obviate all the unpleasant circumstances which might occur to him when he arrived at Corinth, to the prejudice of his success and authority, he determined to refute these calumnies, to confirm the proofs which he had already given, and still more to prepare their minds. He therefore wrote a second Epistle in the presence of Timothy, 2 Cor. i. 1. probably in Macedonia, in the fourth year of Nero.

He first mentions his sufferings, and particularly his last dangers in Asia, i. 12. He then speaks of his repeated intention of coming to them by way of Macedonia, which had always continued invariably the same, although he had been obliged to differ its performance for the sake of sparing them, partly also that he might not come sorrowing instead of rejoicing. He forgives him, who had principally grieved him, and wishes to receive him again in love, ii. 12. After this he notices his state of mind at Troas, speaks of the consolations which God had vouchsafed to him, on account of the purity of his views, iii. He states, that he needs no letters of recommendation to them, that their disposition and the dispensation delivered to him by God are his recommendation,—not a Mosaic, but a spiritual and far more glorious dispensation; on which account he preaches openly, and they only find his doctrine obscure, who resist the illumination of the Gospel, iv. 7. That he indeed is also a man, which he well feels from the afflictions which press on him, but which he endures, strengthened by the hopes of a

better state, v. 11. That his conscience consoles him; that he has acted from love to them, and as Christ by his death has reconciled all, so he also intended his mission to have been one of adjustment and reconciliation, having shewn himself in all things a servant of God, vi. 2. Here he interposes a warning against idolatry, vii. 2. and passes on to Titus, and the comfort which he had brought to him. He says that he now regrets having grieved them; yet, the consequence even of this resulted in joy, vii. 16.—That the Macedonians have preceded them in works of charity;—that he hopes they will not also remain behind, on which account he sends Titus back to them, with companions worthy of their regard.—That he doubts not their readiness to relieve the necessities of their poorer fellow-believers, x.

In the 10th chapter he returns to his vindication, and defends himself against the reproaches of his adversaries—that Paul when present was complying, but that at a distance only he found courage to be severe; that he took no pay, but collected money in the churches; then he draws a parallel between himself, his apostleship, and these false apostles, which he continues with great spirit as far as xii. 19. He even fears, he proceeds, (namely from this quarter) an offensive conduct, which he should be obliged, however unwillingly, to oppose with severity. In the conclusion he adds his salutations.

These are the mere skeletons of these two masterly compositions. If we conceive ourselves in the situation in which they were composed, and examine deeply their contents, we cannot do otherwise than admire the judgment in their arrangement and in the management of each separate point of discussion. We are forced to respect this wisdom and

love this benevolence, and to perceive with satisfaction each expression of his heart and soul: to admire this dignity in instructing, this earnestness in entreating, the just proportion observed in praise and encouragement: the interchange of the affections, the transitions from earnestness to sympathy, and from correction to compassion, from friendly solicitation to a powerful and daunting tone; and, above all, this knowledge of mankind, and this foresight in the management of difficult affairs.

SECTION CII.

For the sake of justifying the opinion which I have formed with respect to the merit of these Epistles, I ought not to part from them, without defending the second against the complaints which have undeservedly been made against it. Some pretend not to find in it that well-considered arrangement, that correct succession of ideas, and the union necessary to the maintenance of the connection. Very soon (as is usually the case) they went farther and attempted to deprive the Epistle of particular parts, as not being established according to the notion which they had conceived of its extent, but as being added afterwards[h]. The commencement relates to the Apostle's personal condition, views, state of mind, and wishes, as far as chap. iii. The remainder is divided into three parts, and a conclusion.

[h] The literary history of this subject is found, as usual, completely developed in Bertholdt's Introduction to the Writings of the Old and New Testaments, part vi. sect. 727. Some academical writings, which he cites, I am sorry to say that I have never seen.

In the first part he declares himself a servant of the New Covenant, in which capacity he administers a διακονια of a spiritual description, far more glorious than the Mosaic; not with craft and subtle obscurity, but according to the light of Jesus Christ that it may be made manifest, iv. 7. Yet he carries this treasure about in an earthen vessel: he is a man who fulfils this vocation under all the sufferings incidental to mankind, and has in return only πιστις, that when he shall have become disengaged from this earthly, the reward awaits him in a better state, v. 11. From veneration to God, in imitation of the example of Jesus Christ who died for all to reconcile all, he has a διακονια καταλλαγης[1], a ministry of reconciliation, vi. a διακονια without reproach, which he as a διακονος of God, stedfastly administers through all afflictions, vi. 11. What he here says of the dignity of his ministry, with reference to his Judaizing adversaries and their reproaches, then of his ministry of reconciliation and justification, of its punishments and rewards, is only one part, in which the ideas, though interrupted according to Paul's custom by digressions, continually lead him back to his διακονια. The first considerable digression is (vi. 11. to vii. 2.,) the warning against idolatry.

After this he makes a transition and reverts to Titus, to the comfort which he brought him, and to the effects of the Epistle, which he describes; to the collection, to the good example of the Macedonians, then he mentions a second mission which Titus had accepted on this account, and adds an exhortation, which indeed does not appear necessary, ix.

[1] Cf. Schleusn. in voce καταλλαγη. The Æthiopic translator appositely renders the phrase, መሠልጠኒተ: ሣህሉ ::· *the ministry of his mercy.—Translator.*

15. All which begins with the person of Titus, is connected with him,—finally returns to him, and forms a second connected whole, the cause of which has appeared already in the first Epistle, xvi. 1—6. in the collection there enjoined. It was therefore not written later than the preceding, viz. a short time after the Apostle's meeting with Titus, vii. 6—13.

But least of all could the third part, (viz. the refutation of the reproaches of his adversaries, which he begins at the tenth chapter), be wanting. Those of Paul and Apollos had kept themselves within bounds; but those who called themselves the disciples of Christ πεποιθοτες ἑαυτους του Χριστου ειναι, x. 7. had vented their reproaches on the severity of the Epistle, the collection of money, and on the unfulfilled promises. It was necessary that they should be disarmed, humbled, and rendered inoffensive, ere Paul could come to Corinth. This part, the most important for the defence of his dignity, continues in such a natural progress to the end, that its unity cannot be assailed. Every thing is well conceived relative to its object, and some part (as xi. 13.—xii. 1.) is masterly, in quibus maxime, (according to Cicero's expression) exultat oratio.

What could be objected to this arrangement of its parts? The first part is a general justification of Paul from the idea which he had of his ministry, from the manner in which he exercised it, and from the description of his constant struggle with all sufferings, for which no temporal advantage could compensate him. The second part contains the accounts of Titus and the office of collecting for the poor, which Titus discharged. The third contains the particular defence of several objections to his object, and the total humiliation of his yet remaining adversaries. What is there too little in this? What too much or superfluous? How could they com-

plain of a want of order and consecutiveness, where only one considerable interruption occurs between the first and second parts?

Or, ought the Epistle to have no interruptions, because the subjects were various, and that which was to be discussed was consequently and necessarily divided into several parts? Is not the second part inserted, with great judgment, between the general and particular defence, lest the same subject being continued throughout in one part should weary by means of its length? And should not the most eloquent part, on which the whole history chiefly depended for a termination, form the conclusion, for the sake of perfecting the impression of the whole? The second part, forced in after this, would have become tame, and, after such a lofty style as preceded it, would have been without effect.

It is moreover objected: how different is the tone of the first part, mild, amiable, affectionate; whereas the third part is severe, vehement, and irrespectively castigatory. But who, on this account, would divide Demosthenes' oration *pro coronâ* into two parts, because, in the more general defence, placidity and circumspection predominate, while, on the other hand, in abashing and chastizing the accuser, in the parallel between him and Æschines, words of bitter irony gush out impetuously and fall like rain in a storm? Every kind of discourse allows a flight; but in such an instance can the speech flow on as mildly and softly as in the calm development of motives? What Philologist could require of Paul, that he should no where allow to himself a flight in his discourse, under the penalty, that such a part of it should be separated from the rest?

All that may reasonably be said, may be comprised in this, that now and then in the first chapters the

sentences are intricate, the cause of which, as is reasonable, has been sought in the Apostle's agitated state of mind[k].

SECTION CIII.

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

Paul went from Ephesus, after having left Timothy behind him, to Macedonia, 1 Tim. 1. 3. and soon after wrote this Epistle. The Apostle was twice at Ephesus; when did he write this?

After his first visit to this city, Acts xviii. 19—23, he travelled to Jerusalem, and the journey to Macedonia, which is mentioned in the Epistle, did not take place in it.

The other visit to Ephesus is related in the Acts of the Apostles, xix. 1.—xx. After rather a long stay, he was obliged to leave the town on account of an uproar, and then he commenced the journey to Macedonia, Acts xx. 1. At that time the Epistle was written, between the first and second to the Corinthians.

Should we be desirous of proposing a still later visit of the Apostle to Ephesus, besides the two mentioned in the Acts, which he might have made after his Roman imprisonment, the circumstances would not allow it. Among other things, the Epistle suggests the idea, that the teachers and superintendents of the church, who were designed to conduct it, were not as yet nominated. This however took place a few months afterwards, when Paul returned from

[k] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. part i. sect. 225.

his Macedonian journey to Asia, when he appointed the superintendents of Ephesus to meet him at Miletus, for the purpose of seeing them in their new vocation, and of representing and impressing upon them the obligations of the office which they had accepted, Acts xx. 17—28. The Epistle must consequently precede this event.

Correct as all this is, really true as all this may appear, it still is subject to one doubt. Before Paul travelled from Ephesus to Macedonia, he sent before him Timothy and Erastus, Acts xix. 22.; how then could Timothy have remained behind at Ephesus?

He also sent Titus to Corinth, and though he was charged to observe the community and the effects, which the Epistle produced on it, and to prepare the collection, (Sect. 100.) nevertheless he again expected him at Troas, 2 Cor. ii. 12. Much more might Timothy, who had no commission to detain him, (Sect. 89.) have reached Paul in time, pursuant to the injunction, 1 Cor. xvi. 11.

But the difficulty consists in this: the Apostle had resolved to stay at Ephesus till Pentecost, 1 Cor. xvi. 8, but was obliged by an uproar unexpectedly to leave the place earlier, Acts xix. 22. If he had been driven away sooner, it is of no importance; for, we could also prove, that Timothy might have arrived even earlier. If he preferred to go by sea, as may be expected from the favorable season of the year, he would be back in sixteen days. (Sect. 98.) If then he departed on the third day after the Passover, from which the fifty days to Pentecost are reckoned, he would have been at Ephesus thirty-four days before Pentecost. If he decided to go round by Macedonia and Troas, he arrived in thirty-one days at Ephesus, nineteen days before Pentecost. In each case, he arrived sooner by a considerable time: who then

could prove, that he nevertheless arrived too late? On the contrary, Paul did not meet him first at Troas, nor in Macedonia; it was only Titus, whom he joined on the road, on account of which he repeatedly expresses his joy in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, without even distantly thinking of such a fortunate meeting with Timothy. The Apostle was also not driven away so much earlier, that Timothy could not have reached him at Ephesus. The time made so little difference, that notwithstanding this occurrence, he calculated upon finding Titus at Troas, whither he had appointed him, 2 Cor. xi. 12. If now the difference of time was not of such importance, as to have obliged him to renounce meeting Titus at the place where he had appointed him, the whole difference must only have been small, perhaps not have amounted to nineteen days, during which Timothy, even if he had taken the most circuitous way, arrived before the time at Ephesus.

Paul might therefore have left him behind in this city, when he was obliged to save himself by flight, and given to him the commissions, which the Epistle contains. But as soon as they were performed, he repaired to the Apostle, with whom he is again found, when the second Epistle to the Corinthians was written, 2 Cor. i. 1.

SECTION CIV.

But, it is answered, could Timothy so precipitately quit the post assigned to him? dared he to do so without having been recalled? For, if we suppose that all which the Epistle required had been performed, yet was he farther appointed to watch the

Heretics. Assuredly so: but be it permitted to us, in this particular, to observe that the expression παραγγειλῃς, 1 Tim. i. 3. "that thou mayst declare to some," &c. &c. has not been accepted in a more extensive signification than it possesses: moreover, he was not to engage in farther discussions with them[1], iv. 7.

However, be this as it may; but when it is asked, could Timothy so soon quit his post, we may also ask, on the other hand, could he indeed remain any longer? Paul was in danger of his life, when he quitted Ephesus, 2 Cor. i. 8, 9; Timothy was accessory to all of which Paul was accused, Acts xix. 24.—xx. If now the enemies of the Apostle had discovered his presence, which indeed could not have been long concealed, could he then still have remained? And if this were not advisable, what else could he well do, but arrange all, which time allowed him to arrange, and then hasten to his teacher, with whom we soon afterwards find him.

Now, if he had finished his business at Ephesus as he ought, would there still have been time to reach Paul in Macedonia? We must once more repeat, that Paul had resolved to stay at Ephesus until Pentecost, 1 Cor. xvi. 21, but he was driven away before that time, and betook himself to Hellas by way of Macedonia, Acts xx. 1, 2. Here he made some stay, and started with the approaching spring; and it was Easter, ere he reached Asia again, Acts xx. 6. The journey consequently lasted from Whitsuntide till Easter again, *i. e.* one year, minùs fifty days, or

[1] Œcumenius says, ἐν τῇ Ἐφεσῳ τινες Ἰουδαιζοντες ἐπεχειρουν ἑτεροδιδασκαλειν, και ἀπατᾷν τους ἀκεραιους προφασει τοῦ νομοῦ· τουτο δε μαθων ὁ Ἀποστολος, προτρεπει τον Τιμοθεον ἐκει προσμειναι προς διορθωσιν αὐτῶν. κ. τ. λ.—*Translator.*

about ten months. Three of these he staid in Hellas, Acts xx. 3. namely the winter months, whilst he applied the beginning and better part of the season to his return, and by Easter had already again arrived at Philippi, Acts xx. 6. The time, therefore, from Whitsuntide to November, four full months, not includlng the days, by which he quitted Ephesus sooner than he had intended, coincides with the first part of the journey, with the journey from Ephesus to Hellas, where he remained over the winter, μῆνας τρεις, probably during November, December, and January.

Now if Timothy staid at Ephesus two months, the supernumerary days not being included, there yet remained two months for him to overtake the Apostle in Macedonia. But if he, on account of impending danger, thought not himself so long safe at Ephesus, the journey to Macedonia gains, in proportion to that which is lost to the stay in Ephesus. So simple is the whole cause, why we do not comprehend the reckoning! from which the contrary has lately been proved [m].

As to what regards the Epistle to Timothy, it must have been one of the first cares of the Apostle, for it was otherwise to be feared that the instructions, according to which Timothy was to proceed, would arrive after the work was completed. It was written therefore in the fourth year of Nero, in the fifty-ninth year of the Christian era.

[m] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. part i. sect. 248. p. 342, 343.

SECTION CV.

Ephesus, where Timothy had to act as the Apostle's Plenipotentiary, was the chief city of the province of Asia, and on account of its excellent situation, the greatest and most considerable trading place within the Taurus, which in the first period of Christianity was daily more and more flourishing[n]. All the splendor of its edifices was eclipsed by the Temple of Diana, which antiquity numbered among its wonders. Wealth, not to mention other causes, produced luxury and effeminacy. In Nero's time this city was described, not only as voluptuous, but also as arrogant, so that the coarse tone of its inhabitants did not appear to agree with its refinement in other respects[o]. The propensity to the most rare and studied ornaments, and the love of jewels, dress, and splendid decorations was not confined exclusively to the female sex[p].

With respect to the Jews who lived here, they had not shewn themselves very yielding to Paul during his stay, and even the rest of the Believers still adhered for a long time[q] to magical doctrines and

[n] Strabo L. xiv. 1ma Casaub. p. 441. and 2da. p. 642. Seneca, Epist. cii. Ephesum aut Alexandriam aut si quod est etiamnum frequentius incolis, latius tectis solum.

[o] Philostrat. in vitâ Apollon. Thyan. L. viii. c. 3. L. iv. c. 1.

[p] Athenæus, Deipnos. L. ii. c. 29. Schweigh.

[q] As far as Hermeneutics are concerned, this may be called a locus vexatissimus. The Jewish exorcists were probably analogous to the בעלי שם or בעלי שם־המפורש, who pretended to perform various incantations by means of the Tetragrammaton. From their fables and ineptiæ, the Arabs seem to have borrowed their علم اسم الله, by means of which they pretend to heal the bites of serpents,

arts, Acts xix. 8. 18, 19. Besides these faults, in consequence of other opinions in these regions, the duties of the marriage state, even after the adoption of Christianity, were not so strictly observed as they required to be. Ephes. v. 22.—vi. Coloss. iii. 18—21. But particularly, whilst the doctrine of the Apostle diffused such mild principles, and declared so loudly the equality of all mortals before God and Jesus, requisitions were agitated among an unsafe

to give sight to the blind, expel evil agency, restore the lame, &c. &c. of which a copious account may be seen in Al Beidavi and Jellale'ddin. From the Syrian translator we infer, that these impostors whirled themselves round, when performing their incantations, like some of the modern Dervishes, ؟ܐܬܪܡܝ ܐܬܬܪܡܝ ܐܬܬܪܡܝ ; which the Æthiopic corroborates. From Luke's use of the word περιεργα, which is interpreted μαγειαι και θεουργιαι, there can be no doubt of the nature of the books, which were burned: hence the Syrian says, ؟ܒܝ ܐܦ ܣܝܡܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܕܐܬܬܪܡܝ, and the Arabic, وكثيرون من صانعي الاسحار جلبوا مصاحفهم

These writings were commonly called Ἐφεσια Γραμματα: cf. Aristænet. L. ii. Ep. 18. Hesych. *in voce*, Clem. Alex. Strom. l. v. p. 568. Niebuhr mentions similar magical characters among the Arabs, of which Professor Hammer has given to us copious alphabets. These Ἐφεσια Γραμματα are referred by Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. l. i. p. 306.) to the Idæi Dactyli. From Plutarch and Diogenianus we collect, that the feet, zone, and crown of the statue of Diana at Ephesus were inscribed with them. But, as medicine and pharmaceutics were usually admixed with these impostures, the Jews seem to have followed the general example, which we infer from their denomination ἐξορκισται, which is often equivalent to φαρμακεῖς. Probably Augustus burnt the fatidical books, from a notion that they were of this description: "quicquid fatidicorum librorum Græci Latinique generis, nullis vel parum idoneis auctoribus, vulgo ferebatur, supra duo millia contracta undique cremavit," (Sueton. in vitâ, 31). This he may have done from religious principles, for Livy (l. ix. dec. iv.) says, that it was repeatedly enjoined to magistrates, "Vaticinos libros conquirerent, comburerentque, omnem disciplinam sacrificandi, præterquam Romano more, abolerent."—*Translator.*

class of men, which required to be confined within limits. For the slaves extended these principles of equality and fraternity in the sight of God too much to the service, which they owed to their masters and the common affairs of life, and waged in their hearts a moral *bellum servile*, Ephes. vi. 5—10., Col. iii. 22., iv. 2.

This was nearly the state of things at Ephesus, when Paul was obliged to make a hasty retreat at a time, when he did not expect it. We may therefore easily perceive, that the preliminary measures were yet wanting, which ought to have been adopted in the case of his departure. He had hitherto conducted the whole with full power, without (as we may conclude from the Epistle) having as yet nominated the persons who, in future, should superintend the ministry and the affairs of the Society. Nor had he yet committed the nomination of them to Timothy, but only conceded to him the superintendence of this choice, and communicated to him the precepts, which should serve as the rule in it.

SECTION CVI.

With respect to this state of affairs, however imperfect may be the description of it, there prevails in the Epistle a very beautiful order and correct consecutiveness of the subjects, which are discussed in it. The introduction contains the following ideas; warn them against heretical fables, also concerning the law, which, if rightly understood, is indeed good; yet, according to our doctrine, was given only on account of the wicked, to whom I also belonged, having been saved by Christianity, as all

sinners must be. Hence, the first of his arrangements for divine worship is Prayer[r]; on which subject, doubts prevailed among the converts from Judaism, with respect to praying for the Heathen magistrates,

[r] Several opinions have been indulged respecting the difference subsisting between δεησεις, προσευχαι, and ἐντευξεις. The first Hesychius interprets παρακλησις—χρεια, and another gloss ἱκεσια. Theodoret and Theophylact define it to be ὑπερ ἀπαλλαγης τινῶν λυπηρῶν ἱκετεια (ἱκετηρια Theoph.) προσφερομενη; but Gregory Nazianzen conceives it to be ἡ αἰτησις ἐνδεῶν. The second Chrysostom explains by ἱκετηρια and παρακλησις, in which Cyrill Alexandrinus, Basil, Olympiodorus, Theodoret, and Gregory Nyssene agree with him in substance. If we, however, collate the passages in which it occurs, we shall perceive that it has likewise other significations, among which that of *deprecation* is very manifest. The LXX apply it both to נדר and תפלה. The third Theophylact expounds κατηγορια τῶν ἀσεβουντων, ἡ ἀδικουντων, ἡ ἀδιορθωτων, with which Theodoret] and Hesychius coincide; the latter however adds, δεησις εἰς ἐκδικησιν. The MS. Lexicon quoted by Alberti, defines it to be παρακλησις προσαγομενη Θεῷ περι σωτηριας ἑτερῶν. Origen and others have also explained this triple classification, some in one way, some in another.

The Rabbinical writers mention seven sorts of prayers, which Triglandi (apud Ugolinium) has discussed: Vitringa, also de Synagogâ veteri et Schoettgen, *in loco*, have copiously treated of them, to whom the inquirer is referred. It must however be observed, that the Jews make a particular distinction between תפלה. רנה and בקשה, the two last of which are equally distinguished in the modern Jewish liturgies. Δεησεις seem to answer to the בקשות, which were shorter, and arose from the occasion, the προσευχαι to the תפלות, which were *stated forms*, the ἐντευξεις to the תחנונות, which were generally shorter than the προσευχαι, and also arose from the occasion: for, in this passage, the Syriac makes use of ܐܬܪܥܝ, and in other respects they appear more accordant with the preceding definitions. These varieties are explained in Lexicon Aruch: yet, after every research into the subject, the matter must be left to private judgment. In the 8th verse, the Apostle censured a Jewish dogma, that it is unlawful to pray on a day when a person had been angry, thus in Erubhin. f. 68. i. R. Hhanina is said on this account to have abstained from his prayers: ר״חנינא ביומא דרתח לא מצלי. —*Translator.*

ii. 1—9. He then determines, after a short correction of female vanity, the share which the women should take in the affairs of the Church, ii. 9., iii.; and enumerates the qualifications, which he requires from persons who should obtain the ministry and the care of the Churches,—from Presbyters, Deacons, and Deaconesses, iii. 14. After which, he makes a transition, by means of a brief sketch of the orthodox doctrine respecting the person of Jesus, iii. 14., iv. 1., to false doctrines, and points out to him the principles which he should inculcate against them, iv. 12. To this he annexes counsels which concern Timothy himself, v. He draws his attention to the conduct, which he owes to the appointed presbyters, to his behaviour toward the widows, and to the measures, which he should adopt respecting them, v. 17. He afterwards speaks of the pay to the presbyters, of the conduct necessary, if complaints should be raised against them, and of the proper caution in ordaining them, v. 22., and by means of a transition as far as vi. 1., he admonishes the slaves, to which he adds, exhortations to Timothy himself and some warnings and doctrines to the faithful in general.

SECTION CVII.

This Epistle has lately obtained an important antagonist, who without hesitation deprives the Apostle of it, and ascribes it to some unknown author[s]. We have already anticipated some of his arguments, as, for instance, the one that Timothy is found again with Paul, shortly after having been said to have received the alleged Epistle of the Apostle containing

[s] On the first Epistle of Paul, as it is called, to Timothy. A critical Epistle to I. C. Gasz, by F. Schleiermacher, Prof. at Halle, etc. Berlin, 1807. 8vo.

such difficult commissions, and another, which this scholar conceives that he has discovered in the obvious want of order and connection (p. 152.); but several of them still remain for our present consideration.

The language also, says the opponent of the Epistle, cannot be that of Paul. To shew which, he collects expressions (from the beginning as far as p. 76.) which occur besides in none of Paul's Epistles, or at least not with the same signification. But this is more or less the case in other Epistles likewise; nor know I, how any one can expect, that Paul should not make use of words in one Epistle, which he has not already used in another; or that he should pour into each of them all the expressions, with which his vocabulary was supplied. However, some of them, at least, occur in the New Testament; as, *νομοδιδασκαλος, πρεσβυτηριον, ἀσπιλος, περιεργος, ἀπωθεισθαι την πιστιν, τον λογον*, &c. But others, which are distinguished by a bolder composition, or self-derivation, and in which the opponent of the Epistle would fain perceive an attempt at novelty; as, for instance, *ἑτεροδιδασκαλειν, ἀγαθοεργειν, εὐμεταδοτος, διλογος, διωκτης*, &c. betray Paul even in their structure, who, unshackled by the laws of grammatical autonomy compounds his own words and forcible expressions, or derives them in a manner in which tragic authors would scarcely have indulged themselves, viz. *καλοδιδασκαλος, ἀφιλαγαθος, ὀρθοποδειν, αὐτοκατακριτος, ὁλοθρευτης*[1].

[1] When I was preparing the first edition of this introduction, Henry Planck, the learned son of a celebrated Father, was employed upon the refutation of Schleiermacher's Epistle: *Remarks on the first Epistle of Paul to Timothy in reference to the critical Epistle of Professor Fr. Schleiermacher.* Götting. 1808. That which I could only treat in a general manner, is here,

If we, independently of this peculiarity, examine the whole of the diction, we shall find it assuredly Paul's. The accumulation of words of allied significations or false synonyms, the enumerations, the short instantaneous bursts; the parentheses, particularly the long parenthesis, i. 5—18: then the animation, which pervades the whole: all this is not an imitation in the use of certain words, in which any one might easily succeed, but the fac-simile of his peculiar mode of communication.

If also we compare (as some have done) the first Epistle to Timothy with the second to him and with the Epistle to Titus, because they frequently coincide in matter, and then, where the idea or expression in the one is applied differently in the other, conclude from this circumstance, that it resembles the Plagiarism of some individual, who has not on all occasions rightly understood Paul, (from p. 78), it were somewhat too precipitate a conclusion. For it is Paul's custom, when he repeats ideas or metaphors and introduces the same idea into other Epistles, to give to them as much as possible, another turn, that, at least, they may thereby obtain a certain novelty, and may not be mere repetitions. Not to discuss, however, single passages, let us take together the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, and observe how he has conducted himself in the treatment of similar subjects, and how my remarks are confirmed in things and words. By a like paralogism, it would not be at all difficult, whichever of these two Epistles we suppose to be genuine, in this manner to prove the other to be spurious, and to shew that it is a coun-

sentence by sentence, with reference to every expression, and the notion connected with it, as far as both belong to Paul, carefully separated and developed with exegetical accuracy.

terfeit, the author of which has often not rightly understood Paul, and has imitated him in the phraseology unsuccessfully or even obscurely.

The great doubts however which are raised against it, (p. 104—113), because he has so very briefly mentioned Hymenæus and Alexander, i. 20., are of no moment. He mentions them incidentally, as well known examples of erring self-conceit, and for no other purpose besides, as he has also done in other passages, at this period of his life, namely, 2 Tim. i. 15. and ii. 17., where he also points out well known examples, (οἰδας τουτο) of error, as a warning to others: and he does this also incidentally: ὡν ἐστι Φυγελλος και Ἑρμογενης, or ὡν ἐστιν Ὑμεναιος και Φιλητος.

But a new difficulty is started:—in the first Epistle to Timothy Hymenæus and Alexander are associated together, and in the second Hymenæus and Philetus, and afterwards, for the first time, this Alexander is brought forward, and then, not as a heretic, 2 Tim. iv. 14.—a proof, that the author of the first Epistle has confounded the persons through ignorance. This Alexander, 2 Tim. iv. 14., is certainly no heretic; Paul designates him by a predicate ὁ χαλκευς, the worker in metals or the smith, and he appears to be the individual, (Acts xix. 33.), who appeared at the Roman tribunal, among the accusers of the Apostle. But might there not have been one* Alexander a heretic and as this name was

* Little or no information, on which dependence may be placed, can be collected concerning these individuals. Schoettgen doubts, on very suspicious authority, whether Alexander ὁ χαλκευς were really a Smith. He seems to determine him to have been a Rabbi, because the Jews always joined some handicraft to their severer studies, annexing its particular designation to their proper names. From finding in Yoma f. 54. 2. ר" יצחק נפחא *Rabbi Isaac the Smith*, he gratuitously infers Alexander also to have been ר" אלכהנדרי נפחא. Equally fabulous are the details of the Fathers. The author of

so common, might there not have been at that time many hundreds of Alexanders? But, it is asked, why is he mentioned in the first Epistle with Hymenæus as a partaker of the heresy, and not in the second? where Philetus is associated in his stead with Hymenæus. But I ask on the other hand, was it indispensable, that they should always have been together from a necessary and immutable connection of circumstances? Or was this Alexander immortal, that he should always be necessarily enumerated among the living examples of perversity? or was he so incorrigible, that he could never cease to be what he once was? Or could not Hymenæus have so extended and changed his doctrine, that Alexander might have differed from him in opinions and belonged no longer to his sect? Where there are so many other possibilities, each of which is equally probable, dare I at pleasure to assume one of them as certain? and consider my conclusions from it as true?

Thecla's Martyrdom states, that Alexander incurred Paul's displeasure, for having accused Thecla, in revenge of an ineffectual attempt made by him on her chastity, before the Roman tribunal, by which she was condemned to the beasts, which were miraculously deprived of the power of injuring her. Tryphœna mentioned by the Apostle is here likewise said to have been the person, who protected her from the impure attempts of Alexander and others, cf. Rom. xvi. 12. If then, so little can be known of these individuals, how is it possible to determine their identity, in the separate places where they are mentioned? and from want of fuller records, how much more impossible is it, to establish any just argument on the brief notice given of them? Schleiermacher, in his observations on St. Luke and on this Epistle, trusts more to his ingenuity than to critical research: the philological remarks, which he has occasionally made, prove him not to have studied the peculiarities of the Hellenistic dialect with sufficient accuracy, and to have been rather anxious of erecting a theory, than of providing against the objections, to which it might be exposed. The whole of his animadversions on this Epistle consist of excursions of the fancy, not of the convictions of the judgment.—*Translator.*

Let us, however, examine Paul once more; in the first Epistle to Timothy he speaks of heretics, whom he has banished from the Church, without entering into the particulars of their doctrines, and names Hymenæus and Alexander, i. 20., but in the second, where he inculcates the doctrine of the resurrrection of our Lord, and joins with it our own resurrection, ii. 8—16., the subject leads him to a particular sect of heretics, who asserted that the resurrection of men had already taken place, and there he names as the authors of this assertion, Hymenæus and Philetus, ii. 17. Both cases are therefore different. Alexander might be included in the first, without being comprized in the accusations of the second.

Finally, it is objected to us (p. 124.) that Paul speaks, Acts xx. 29—31., of the heretics, (on whose account, according to the first Epistle he is said to have left Timothy behind him at Ephesus,) some months after its composition, just as if there were none at that time existing:—he speaks in the [a] future tense, as if they were about to come. But the first Epistle to Timothy has likewise this object: it is provident for the future, ἐν ὑστεροις καιροις, in which they would, according to manifest indications, raise their heads, iv. 1. They, whose conduct had become notorious, were like Hymenæus and Alexander banished from the Church, i. 20.; but others silently concealed their inclination to strange opinions, and dared not to acknowledge them publicly or even to teach, ἑτεροδιδασκειν, although their inclination to assent to other teachers (for such is the sense of ἑτεροδιδασκαλειν; namely ἑτεροις διδασκαλοις προσεχειν, *alienos magistros sectari*) did not escape the sharp sight of the Apostle. He applies immediately to it the perfectly descrip-

[a] εἰσελευσονται . . . ἀναστησονται.

tive expression, προσεχειν—μυθοις; which does not signify *to teach,* but *to approve, to adhere to,* προσεχειν τον νοῦν, την γνωμην. On this account Timothy also receives no stronger commands against them than παραγγελλειν, *to charge them,* and if such absurdities come into question, iv. 17., *to avoid them,* παραιτειν. The Apostle also himself enacts nothing against them, but contents himself, in the chief passage where he speaks of them, with bringing without captiousness to the recollection of every one the example of Hymenæus and Alexander. There were consequently no professed false teachers at that time in the Church, but the danger existed, that such would arise with the first opportunity, when there should be no higher authority any longer to keep them in awe.

SECTION CVIII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

It is unknown, who first published Christianity at Rome: but we may safely number Andronicus and Junius among the earliest messengers of the faith, or promoters of its doctrines, Rom. xvi. 7. Among them were also Rufus *, perhaps he whose father assisted our Lord in bearing the cross (Rom. xvi. 13., Mark xv. 21.) Herodion and other converts from Judaism, who had laboured to circulate the faith. For Christianity, even in this place, was introduced by means of the Synagogue and made such rapid advances, that the faith of the Romans at

* Some critics assert his Roman name to have been Ruffinus.—*Translator.*

the time, that Paul wrote to them, was already renowned throughout the whole Christian world, i. 8.

The Jews at Rome were very numerous; they occupied beyond the Tiber a great part of the city. They were principally freed men brought to Rome, (by Pompey) as prisoners, and liberated by their masters, because they were to Roman masters a more troublesome than useful property, from their stedfast adherence to their Jewish customs and ordinances. They then built for themselves synagogues in the part of the city which was allotted to them [y], kept their Sabbaths and religious meetings, and remained still so attached to their temple and native land, that they annually sent to it considerable presents and offerings [z].

Curiosity and other motives brought the Roman women often to their Sabbatic festivals and Synagogues. Ovid even refers the young nobles of his day thither, to the

Cultaque Judæo septima sacra Syro,

that they might see the beauties of Rome assembled there.

Many thus learned and appreciated the religious institutions of the Jews, and became σεβομεναι and *metuentes*, of which Josephus cites an instance in the case of a certain Fulvia [a]. Gradually, this inclination to Judaism also communicated itself to the men, whose *Un*-Roman opinions the poet describes with great wit:—

Quidam sortiti metuentem Sabbata patrem,
Nîl præter nubes, et Cœli numen adorant:
Nec distare putant humanâ carne suillam,
Quâ pater abstinuit, mox et præputia ponunt.
Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,

---

[y] Philo. legat. ad Caj. p. 697. ed. Turneb.
[z] Cicero pro Flacco, c. 28.
[a] Antiq. Jud. L. XVIII. c. 3. n. 5.

Judäicum ediscunt, et servant, ac metuunt jus,
Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses [b].

As Christianity was also preached in the Sabbatic assemblies, it became circulated among the Gentiles, and many of them embraced the new doctrine, which rejected, as a worldly religious institution, those troublesome singularities, which Judaism required, and enjoined that reasonable and spiritual service, by means of virtuous dispositions and morality, which could not fail of the approbation of noble and enlightened men. There arose consequently in Rome a church composed of Jewish and Gentile Christians.

SECTION CIX.

About this time the Jews were expecting Christ or the Messiah almost universally: but the notions, which they entertained of him, so exclusively confined his mission and the circle of his operations to their own nation, that it seemed impossible for any one to have a share in his benefits, who did not belong to them at least as a proselyte. They expected him as a hero or as a King, who would elevate them to the rank of an independent nation, render them formidable to the world by their victories, and wrest from the Romans the *imperium orbis terrarum*. These hopes were partly the causes, which in the East brought to maturity the resolution of tolerating op-

[b] Juvenal Sat. xiv. v. 96. These, *qui Cæli numen adorant*, seem to be the same, whom the Codex Theodosianus calls *Cœlicolas*, who are also mentioned in Justinian, *leg.* 7. *cod. de Judäicis et Cœlicolis* —namely Judaizing Gentiles.

pressions no longer, of placing themselves in a state of resistance, and of beginning that desperate war, which eleven years after Paul had written his Epistle to the Romans, terminated their national and civil existence [c].

These notions of the Messiah were by no means very acceptable to the Gentiles, but much less so to the Romans. For in Rome they had besides several causes of discontent with the government. Claudius had, on his assumption of the empire, interdicted [d]

[c] Joseph. de. Bel. Jud. vi. 5. Acts xvii. 7. Sueton. in Vespasian. c. 4. Tacit. Histor. L. v. c. 13.

[d] The idea of the birth of some exalted personage had extended itself all over the civilized world, at the time of our Saviour's appearance. If we had no other authority to prove the currency of these notions among the Romans, the fourth Eclogue of Virgil would be sufficient. When, however, the Jews claimed this Personage exclusively to themselves, adduced splendid and determinate prophecies respecting him, and asserted him the future conqueror of the world and subjugator of their enemies, it was natural to suppose, that the Romans, then lords of the world, should direct a jealous eye against every suspicious appearance in this nation. We observe Pilate actuated by this fear; he laboured to release Christ, and persisted in his endeavours, until his adversaries had recourse to the artifice of representing to him, that by stiling himself a King, Christ opposed himself to Cæsar and excited seditions, which offence the Roman law (Paullus c. v. sent. tit. 22.) condemned to *the cross*. Several reasons combined to render the Romans hostile to numerous assemblies of individuals. The Dionysiaca, &c., by admixing lasciviousness with religion, had undermined the public sense of decency, and consequently assemblies of this description were prohibited by the S. C^tum^. Marcianum. These meetings were mostly holden in the night, and the Romans had been subjected to conspiracies and other dangers from nocturnal meetings: hence Cicero (in Catilinam II. 19.) observes "primò in decem tabulis cautum esse cognoscimus, ne quis in urbe nocturnos cœtus agitârit: deinde lege Gabiniâ promulgatum, qui coïtiones ullas clandestinas in urbe conflavîsset, *more majorum capitali supplicio multaretur*." No *civis Romanus seù Socius Nominis Latini* could frequent them, unless the senate having been previously consulted, license was granted to him from the

all great meetings and even the religious assemblies of

Prætor Urbanus. Some, however, have asserted, that the Christians were persecuted on account of their nocturnal assemblies, but this was not the case;—other reasons forcibly combined to excite persecution against them. Many conspiracies had indeed been discussed and matured in meetings ostensibly convoked for religious purposes, which the Greeks called *νυκτελια*; but Pliny's testimony, that at their meetings, "se sacramento non in scelus aliquod obstringerent, sed ne furta, latrocinia, vel adulteria committerent," completely exonerates them from this imputation. The assertion, however, has been supported from 1 Thess. v. 2. and 2 Pet. iii. 10., which connected their fears of this expected conqueror with these assemblies. This, however, we are disposed to doubt; because *ὡς κλεπτης ἐν νυκτι* must have been considered rather as an illustration, than a historical statement, it must, from profane examples, which we might produce, have been interpreted, *subitò—inopinatò*, &c. And we may reasonably dispute such an intimate acquaintance with the Christian writings. We may readily suppose, that the vivid expectations of Christ's second advent, and the description of the glory and great power, in which he should return, "*putting down all rule, and all authority and power, and 'reigning' till 'he should have' put all enemies under his feet,*" 1 Cor. xv. 24, 25. in which the Christians openly indulged, caused them to regard these expectations as dangerous to the welfare of the capital. Yet the nocturnal assemblies did not enter into the consideration, for Pliny affirms, that "Cæsares benè precati sunt;" and Suetonius (*in vitâ Vespasiani*, c. 4.) clearly suggests this reason, "percrebuerat ORIENTE TOTO *vetus et constans opinio*, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore *Judææ profecti rerum potirentur*. Id de Imperatore Romano, quantum posteà eventû paruit, prædictum, *Judæi ad se trahentes, rebellárunt*." Tacitus, (Hist. v. 13.) confirms this statement: "plurimis persuasio inerat, antiquis Sacerdotum libris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, *ut valesceret Oriens, profectique Judææ rerum potirentur*, quæ ambages Vespasianum et Titum prædixerant. Sed vulgus, more humanæ cupidinis, *sibi tantam fatorum magnitudinem interpretati*, ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur." Josephus, B. J. vi. 31. and Hegesippus, l. v. 44. notice the same thing: the passage, to which allusion is made, seems to be *ἐκ σου ἐξελευσεται ὁ ἡγουμενος*, which the immense circulation of the LXX. renders probable.

The Christians seem to have been frequently confounded with the Jews by the Roman writers. Although the Romans introduced *in numerum Deorum* the Deities of foreign nations, yet the Christian religion not being recognized, and being subversive of the esta-

the Jews; a grievance which they naturally could not receive with indifference *.

As therefore at Rome, the accounts of the appearance of the Messiah were continually becoming more frequent from Palestine, we may very easily imagine, that Christianity, contrary to its principles, inflamed the imagination of many, who were full of adventurous ideas and occasioned an untimely breaking out of their discontent. The passage of Sueto-

blished worship, was an infringement of the law. "Separatim nemo habessit Deos, neve novos, sed nec advenas, nisi publicè ascitos, *privatim colunto*." (Cicero de leg. l. ii. c. 8.) Hence, according to Dio Cass. Domitian accused them of Atheism, and Justin with others of the Fathers complained ἀθεοι κεκλημεθα :— Trajan, Decius, Galerius, and Diocletian persecuted them, on this account, because they destroyed the worship of the Gods: and because the assemblies of the Jews and Christians were numerously attended, the decree of Severus interdicted Roman citizens from frequenting them. The Christian accounts prove the same fact. Hence arose the many absurd charges of magic, Thyestean banquets, &c. which were made against them; for the bread and wine which were indispensable to their communion, being symbols of compacts and treaties, were distrustfully distorted into proofs of a conspiracy against Paganism.

Their nocturnal meetings were not therefore the cause of their persecutions. Their classification under the *nomen Judaicum* contributed greatly to the aversion, in which they were holden. And the Jews had increased this by the continual disturbances, in which they were involved, by their excesses in Ægypt, Cyprus, and Cyrene, by the factions under Barcocab and other impostors, by those at Rome, whence they were said to have perpetually tumultuated, *impulsore Chresto*, and by that under Judas Gaulonites, under which the Romans seem to have included the Christians, from their appellation Galilæi or Gaulonitæ, without reference to chronology. In latter times, when Rome was taken by Alaric, the capture was supposed to have been occasioned by the anger of the Gods in consequence of the overthrow of their altars. These, therefore, not *the cœtus nocturni*, were, collectively, the causes of the odium and atrocities, which raged against the Christians.—*Translator.*

* Dio. Cass. L. LVIII. p. 459. Rob. Steph. edit. Wechel. LX. p. 669.

nius appears to say something similar; Judæos impulsore *Chresto* assidue tumultuantes (Claudius) Româ expulit [f].

We do not however necessarily apply this passage to the elucidation of our Epistle, and it may be passed over by those, who do not consider it worthy of this importance, even as a piece of learning. Whatever the cause may have been, the Jews conducted themselves at last so turbulently at Rome, that Claudius expelled them from the capital. The circumstance most worthy of our remark in this proscription is, that the Jewish Christians [g] were like-

[f] Sueton. in vita Claudii, c. 25. That the Romans pronounced Chrestus instead of Christus is beyond doubt; they thought that it was the Greek word χρηστος, which they thus pronounced, as all their inscriptions show, in which the name CHRESTUS or CHRESTE occurs. From this opinion of the Romans Justin shows in his great apology, how wrong it is to persecute the Christians on account of the name, if they are called χρηστοι, *good men*. Apol. Maj. p. 136. Ed. Rob. Steph. c. 4. To this likewise the words of Tertullian must be referred, (Apologet. c. 3.) sed cum perperam Christianus pronunciatur à vobis..... de suavitate et benignitate compositum est, where CHRESTIANUS necessarily must be read, as Rigault doubtless has corrected it, whose edition I have not now by me. The most circumstantial explanation is in Lactantius Divinar. instit. L. IV. c. 17. Nam Christus non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis et regni; sic enim Judæi reges suos appellabant. Sed exponenda est hujus nominis ratio, propter ignorantiam eorum, qui eum immutatâ litterâ Chrestum, volunt dicere.... veteres χριεσθαι dicebant ungi, etc. Orosius even read in his copy impulsore Christo assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit, and says; quod, utrum contra Christum tumultuantes coërceri et comprimi jusserit, an etiam Christianos simul velut cognatæ religionis homines voluerit expelli, nequaquam discernitur. Hist. L. VII. c. 6. I perceive a treatise by Ammonius, in loc. Suetonii de vitâ Claud. c. 25. quoted by others; but, unfortunately, I have not been able to obtain a sight of it.

[g] On what authority does Hug confine this to the Christians converted from Judaism? If Christians were included in the term "*Judæi*," it is more likely to have been applied to the whole sect, than to any particular branch of it. But, that Christians in general

wise included in it. We have a proof of it in Aquilas, who, like the other Jews at Rome was expelled, and therefore sought for himself a residence in Corinth, Acts xviii. 2. The distinction between a Jew and a Jewish Christian was consequently not known at that time. AFTER THE BANISHMENT OF THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS, THE SCHOOL OF JESUS AT ROME CONSISTED ONLY OF THE CONVERTS FROM PAGANISM, which is an observation, that we particularly wish to be noticed in this place.

But Aquilas, it is objected, was not a Christian at that time. The narrative of Luke, I think, assumes, that he was; for, if he was first converted by Paul, it would have been an occurrence, which, on account of the services of the man to the Apostle and the Christian school, would have deserved to have been recorded, as well as the conversion of some others, who at that time embraced the faith, Acts xviii. 7, 8.

Yet, whatever may be thought of it, I can nevertheless maintain myself in the possession of this position, that at that time the Jews and Jewish Christians in Rome were not so known apart, and distinguished from each other, for an exception to have been made in favor of the latter, in the order issued against the Jews. How under Claudius in the year, in which Paul for the first time brought the faith into Macedonia, Athens, and Corinth, could they in Rome have already acquired such a knowledge of the new doctrine and its distinctions from Judaism,

were included in it Arrian (l. ii. c. 9.) certifies us, *ὅταν τινα ἐπαμφοτεριζοντα ἰδωμεν, εἰωθαμεν λεγειν, οὐκ ἐστιν Ἰουδαιος, ἀλλ' ὑποκρινεται· ὅταν δ' ἀναλαβῃ το παθος το τοῦ βεβαμμενου και ῥῃμενου, τοτε και ἐστι τῷ ὄντι και καλεῖται Ἰουδαιος.* His subsequent remark, should be particularly noticed, for many Jews resided at Rome under the Emperors subsequent to Claudius.—*Translator.*

as publicly and legally to have recognized this school as separate from Judaism? The Jewish Christians of Rome were even some years afterwards, when Paul wrote to them, not very clear themselves on the subject, and were inclined to consider Christianity as a species of Judaism. Also the heads of Judaism there, when Paul invited them to a conference in the eighth year of Nero, still considered the school of Christ as a sect, αἱρεσις, Acts xxviii. 22. of Judaism, which nevertheless found objections to it on all sides; so that it appears, that the Jews and the Public Authorities in Rome had from the examination of the Apostle, the accusations of his adversaries and his defences, first arrived at the disclosure, that Christianity was a distinct society and a religion of itself. Lastly, if the words of Suetonius, Judæos auctore [h] Chresto assidue tumultuantes Româ expulit, alluded to a misunderstood expectation of the Messiah, how in that case could it be conceived, that the Jewish Christians in particular were exempted from the banishment?

SECTION CX.

But even in better times, when the converts from Judaism and Heathenism still constituted in common one Ecclesiastical society, there was much which was not very favorable to their reciprocal good understanding. The aversion of the Jews to the Romans must, on many occasions, have been felt more by the latter than they wished.

But principally the notions of the Jews with regard to Christ were so contracted and so very much confined

[h] *Leg.* Impulsore.—*Translator.*

to their own nation, that they were far from favoring the Gentiles, as persons, to whom the promises gave no right to their national blessings, and to whom, if they became Proselytes, a share was allotted by sufferance in the advantages, which belonged peculiarly to the children of Abraham.

But they would have had great reason to despise the degenerate Romans, if they themselves had been better, but this nevertheless did not prevent them from doing so, Rom. i. 21.—ii, 3. The description of manners in far better times than those of Claudius and Nero, the depravity of which we can fortunately hardly conceive, convinces us, that it was not necessary to be very good, to consider many things as bad. We here superfluously add such a picture of manners, as was drawn up in the better days of Roman morals; Ex divitiis juventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbiâ invasere, rapere, consumere sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem, pudicitiam, divina atque humana promiscua, nîl pensi neque moderati habere ..... sed lubido stupri, ganeæ, cæterique cultûs non minor incesserat. Viri pati muliebria, mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere, etc.

The motives for misunderstanding between both parties were therefore sufficiently great and numerous, and we shall easily perceive, when we have read the Epistle to the Romans with a moderate attention, that these mostly constitute its contents.

SECTION CXI.

Paul in this Epistle assures the Romans, that the desire, which he has had for many years, of visiting them, is at length become a fixed resolution,

that there had been a collection made in Macedonia and Achaia,—that he intends first to take this to Jerusalem, but that afterwards he would commence his journey to them, for the purpose of seeing them, and going from Rome to Spain, Rom. xv. 23—30.

When the Apostle had settled the Corinthian affairs at Ephesus, he made preparations for his departure. *His intention was to go to Achaia through Macedonia and from thence to Jerusalem; but then, said he, I will see Rome,* Acts xxi. 21. The circumstances, as the history here represents them to us, and the project of the Apostle, are exactly the same as Paul describes them in the Epistle. That period of his life, in which according to the Acts of the Apostles he was encircled with these affairs and occupied with these plans, is consequently the time, in which he composed the Epistle.

Paul, when he wrote it, had concluded his affairs in Macedonia and Achaia; now, says he, I go to Jerusalem, νυνι δε πορευομαι. Rom. xv. 25. In Achaia, Corinth was certainly the place of his abode; the affairs of the Church and his solemn promise had called him thither. When then after having finished his affairs in Achaia, he set out on his return through Macedonia to Asia, and thence to Jerusalem, Acts xx. 3., he began his journey from Corinth, and the Epistle was consequently written in this city immediately before his departure.

Phœbe, a deaconess of Cenchrea, a suburb on the Eastern haven, was travelling from Corinth to Rome: Paul enjoined the Romans to give her a kind reception, Rom. xvi. 1. This local circumstance again points to Corinth and agrees with the foregoing remark[1]. She probably might herself have received

[1] Semler gave to this passage, and to the whole of the 16th chapter

the commission to deliver the Epistle, as a person belonging to the Church.

a very peculiar interpretation, and one very far from the general acceptation. He considers this chapter to have been an addition to the Epistle, which does not concern the readers of it, but was composed for the private information of the bearers of the Epistle, for the purpose of naming to them those persons, with whom they were to stop at the different stations, and with whom they might enter into private conference, and this list of the persons to be visited to have been subsequently added to the Epistle itself.

But the private conference had (Chap. xv.) for its object the Apostle's determined journey to Spain. This xvth chapter which only contains the concerns of Paul, without any real connection with the preceding, may be likewise a distinct one, and indeed the first Appendix, just as the xvith may be called the second, Semleri Paraphras. Epistolæ ad Rom. cum notis. translatione vetustâ, et dissertat. de duplici appendice. Cap. xv, et xvi. Halæ. 1769.

He now conceives, (xvi. 1.) that the bearers of this Epistle should make their first stay at Corinth with Phœbe, then with Aquilas, and should go at other places to different persons. On this occasion it is certainly inconceivable, that Phœbe, with whom they were to sojourn, is not desired to accommodate and assist them,—but that the travellers are commissioned to succour *her*. But the words "*that you receive her*," etc. *ινα προσδεξησθε αὐτην ἐν Κυριῳ ἀξιως των ἁγιων*, he applies to the travellers and explains it *ut eam excipiatis in communionem*,—an artificial gloss, which is easily detected; *προσδεχεσθαι τινα ἐν Κυριῳ*, Philip ii. 29., means in other places to receive one kindly, and according to Christian brotherhood, just as iii. Epist. John 6. *τινα προπεμπειν ἀξιως του Θεου*, signifies,—to forward a person's journey and progress, as it becomes enlightened professors of the same religion.

Then they were also to go to Aquilas to confer with him. That this might take place conveniently, Semler presents him with a house at Corinth. Aquilas, as we know, was ordinarily resident at Rome, before Claudius expelled the Jews from thence, Acts xviii. 1, 2. The Exile went to Corinth, and thence with Paul to Ephesus; here he established himself, and had in his house (1 Cor. xvi. 19, 20) a large room for Christian assemblies: in his house was an *ἐκκλησια*. I know not on what authority the third (or Semler's house at Corinth) rests; for if he appeals for this to Acts xviii. 27, xix. 1. ("*Lucas enim scribit—cum Aquilâ interea Corinthi versatus sit*," &c.) he is too hasty; for there the account relates to Apollos. And

Paul's last residence at Corinth, and his journey to Jerusalem, took place in the middle of the fifth year of Nero. The Epistle was consequently written in this year.

SECTION CXII.

After Paul had been obliged to flee from Ephesus on account of the commotion, Aquilas also quitted this city. The dangers to which he was there exposed, in consequence of his connexion with the Apostle, Rom. xvi. 4. rendered it impossible for him to remain any longer in a place, which offered him but little security. He returned therefore to Rome, where he was, properly speaking, at home, and where Paul in his Epistle mentions and salutes him as resident, Rom. xvi. 3.

For, when Claudius was dead, and Nero's reign appeared, during the first years, so mild and humane, that the best of princes could say of it, " distare

now I suppose that I may be excused from farther arguments in refutation of this hypothesis.

Two observations of Bertholdt (Introduction, 6th part, §. 715, pa. 3303) on this subject, are striking. The salutation which Tertius adds at the end, with the words ὁ γραψας την επιστολην (Rom. xvi. 22) shews, that the whole is one piece, one single epistle. As to what further regards the passage τῳ δυναμενῳ. λ, which in many MSS. occur at the end of Rom. xvi. 25. 27, but is read in most after xiv. 23, the case is thus. Since the salutation, after which it stands in the most ancient books, was not read in the Church-lessons, it must, notwithstanding its beauty, either have been lost, or have been removed from its place, and advanced more forward. The latter was done; but the section immediately before the salutations had already a Doxology; ὁ Θεος της εἰρηνης. λ. xv. 33., for which reason it was transposed still more forward, after xiv. 23., where it appears in all Lectionaries, and in almost all MSS. with cursive characters.

cunctos principes Neronis quinquennio[k], the Jews ventured by degrees to return home. Paul, despairing of his safety in Greece and Asia, was desirous of taking up his abode in Rome, till he went to Spain. Many of Paul's kindred, Rom. xvi. 7. 11, were at that time in Rome; but if we also consider συγγενεις as only being national relations, it still proves the same thing: it proves that the Jewish Christians had returned again to Rome.

This occurrence was of such importance, that it could not escape the attention of the Apostle. THE ROMAN CHURCH, WHICH, FOR A VERY LONG TIME AFTER THE PROSCRIPTION OF THE JEWS, CONSISTED ONLY OF GENTILE CHRISTIANS, NOW AGAIN OBTAINED ITS FORMER MEMBERS, AND ESTABLISHED AND FORMED ITSELF, AS IT WERE, ANEW.

This, then, was the right time for more firmly cementing the union between both parties: for refuting the Jewish prejudices, and combating the arrogance, which had before interrupted the peace and harmony of the Church: for establishing such a mutual understanding, as would insure for the future a permanent duration to the Christian school in the metropolis of the world—such was the object, such is the tendency of this treatise.

It therefore continually concerns itself about this one idea alone, in all its parts: a Jew and a Gentile is equal before God; the qualifications of both, the rights of both, and the imperfections of both are equal. And if a difference could ever have subsisted between them in the eyes of Him, who embraces the whole of mankind with equal beneficence,—it has been abolished by Christ, who unites all, both near and afar off, in one universal religion.

[k] Aurel. Victor. L. 11. c. 5.

The Epistle is more immediately addressed to the Jewish Christians, and a short syllabus of its contents will fully corroborate this view of the subject.

SECTION CXIII.

The Greeks (Ἕλληνες, says Paul, out of forbearance towards the Romans) might have recognized God from Nature. This they did not, therefore they have fallen into vice, i. 18—32.

The Jews have, however, on that account no right to think themselves better; for they also are guilty of the like transgressions, ii. 9.

(The inference). Jews and Gentiles are liable to punishment, when they transgress, both are worthy of reward, when they are virtuous. Before God there is no distinction between them; ii. 12.

* * * * * *

The Gentiles, indeed, have no written law; but they have instead the law of nature and of the heart, which is able to direct them; ii. 16.

The Jews had a written law, but they availed themselves not of its direction; ii. 21.

If they establish their preference on account of the circumcision, still is this nothing without the observance of the Law. Upon the whole, circumcision of the flesh is by no means to be compared with that of the heart; iii.

The Jews may indeed boast of the honour of God having deposited with them his Revelations; but even this serves only to make them ashamed of their disobedience to them; iii. 21.

But now a new Light has succeeded to the old Revelations,—Faith has succeeded to the Law. This

has through Jesus a justifying power, which the Law had not: it operates in behalf of Jews and Gentiles, and God is one God for both; iv.

The Jews think also, that they have an exclusive right to the promises of God. They were given to Abraham and his descendants, and thus belong peculiarly to the sons of Abraham. But were not these promises given to Abraham before the circumcision, when he was yet a Heathen, on account of his Faith? Is he not therefore a Father to all, to the circumcised and uncircumcised, who have Faith like him? v.

Thus the case stands: through Faith in Jesus, and through his propitiation alone we have obtained pardon from God, and shall still more receive it; v. 12.

Accordingly, there is an analogy between Christ and Adam: from Adam to Moses in the law of nature[1] or Heathenism, and from Moses in the Jewish Law, all were sinners in Adam by descent, on account of one sin. Through Jesus all are equally pardoned, and not only for one, but for all sins; vi.

We were buried symbolically in baptism with Jesus, we became dead for our sins, we begin therefore a new life in freedom from sins and in grace; vii.

The Law, as dead, ceases to have obligations upon us. Its obligation continues only till death, as the laws of marriage evince to us; vii. 7.

The Law is indeed a good, but a very imperfect good. It promotes knowledge, but as the passions

[1] The object and tendency of the revelations made to the Patriarchs, and of the separation of the family of Abraham, on which the Apostle has dilated, most irrefutably subvert the distorted and uncritical interpretations, which Calvin affixed to this Epistle, and from which he attempted to deduce the doctrines of unconditional Prædestination and particular Election.—*Translator.*

withdraw men from the perception of it, it aggravates guilt; viii.

Jesus freed us from this Law of sins, and gave that of grace. He kindled our spirit to become masters over our own weaknesses; he obtained for us the indulgence and mercy of God, and shewed to us, for all the struggles of this mortal life an inheritance and a reward, which animates our courage; ix.

* * * * * *

I pity indeed the Jews my brethren, to whom their birth and promises appear to concede a pre-eminent right to the Messiah, for having, nevertheless, fallen short of them. But it is far greater to be a son of Abraham according to Faith, than according to the flesh only. The example of Isaac and Ishmael shews this. God therefore, is not restricted to any birthright, as the history of Esau and Jacob informs us. Nothing can, *by right*, be demanded from him: with him all is *Grace*, which he distributes wisely, although the understanding of mortals does not comprehend it; ix. 29.

God can prefer the Gentiles, if they believe and are constant in virtue; so also can he reject the Jews, if they will not hear the Gospel. It has been proclaimed to all alike,—to Jews and to Gentiles; xi.

There is, indeed, still hope for the unbelieving Jews. Although for the present God has preferred the Gentiles to them, the Gentiles, nevertheless, have no reason to be proud. They are branches engrafted on a foreign stock, which can be lopped off, for the natural branches to be restored. No one can penetrate the plans of the Almighty; iii. 36.

Ye now form one with another a common body. I exhort you therefore to exercise concord, benevolence and love, one toward another—xii.

Respect and honour the higher powers and the laws: for an open and irreproachable conduct becomes us—xiii.

Let no one vex the other by an inconsiderate use of the food offered to idols; spare and edify one another; be ye all, both Jews and Gentiles, unanimous disciples of Jesus Christ, to the glory of God —xiv. 14.

I have indeed taken charge of the Gentiles; for my office, as the Apostle of the Gentiles, requires me to do so—xv. 22.

The project of a journey to Rome and Spain—xvi.

The recommendation of Phœbe and salutations to different persons of the Church at Rome.—*The end.*

SECTION CXIV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

Paul was resolved to go to Rome, as soon as he should have terminated his affairs at Jerusalem: he went there, not indeed as he had proposed to himself, but in fetters and bonds. He was arrested at Jerusalem, brought to Cæsarea, kept there for two years in prison, and at length sent to the tribunal of the Emperor at Rome. He wrote some Epistles from the metropolis, where he was detained so many years in prison; viz. to the Ephesians, the Colossians, to Philemon, as its contents prove, and also the Epistle to the Philippians.

It is difficult to determine which of the three first were composed the earliest or the latest, as neither in that to the Ephesians nor in that to the Colossians the Apostle mentions the circumstances, which sur-

rounded him; but in each of them he refers to Tychicus, who would give to them a verbal account of his situation, Ephes. vi. 21, 22., Coloss. iv. 7, 8.

One proof, in favour of the earliest composition of the Epistle to the Ephesians, consists in the name of Timothy not being prefixed after his own to the Epistle, as is the case in the Epistle to the Colossians and to Philemon, and in all the inscriptions in general, where this his faithful attendant was with him and resident in his society. We may draw the certain conclusion from this prevailing habit of the Apostle, that Timothy was not yet in Rome, that he was not yet in his company, as he was, when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians, Philemon, and to the Philippians, where the fortunes of his master had called him, which he also shared with him until his liberation, Heb. xiii. 23. We shall add a second proof, when we examine the doubts, which have been lately raised against the second Epistle to Timothy, § 131.

SECTION CXV.

This treatise indeed now contains the inscription to the Ephesians, but according to the account of the ancients it appears, that formerly in the introduction, Ephes. i. 1., the name of the city, *i. e.* the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ were wanting.

Basil the Cappadocian maintains against Eunomius on the question, whether it can be said, that the Son of God was begotten ἐξ οὐκ ὀντων, that he is actually the ὀντως ὢν; that this predicate belongs so much the more to him, since even those who are united to him by worship and acknowledgment of him are

called οἱ ὄντες, whilst on the contrary the heathens who do not know the only true God and his Son, are called οὐκ ὄντα.

For, the Apostle Paul in the Epistle to the Ephesians has called the believers ὄντας, when he wrote to them, as τοις ἁγιοις τοις οὐσιν και πιστοις ἐν Χριστῳ Ἰησοῦ, i. 1. He has given to them this title, ἰδιαζοντως, *exclusively* or *peculiarly*, as earlier authorities and old MSS., in which he (Basil) himself so found it [m], also assure us.

This passage must then certainly have contained something peculiar or emphatic, since Basil made such an assertion respecting it, since he resorts to older Teachers and older MSS. for the confirmation of this peculiarity. But that which we remark in it is, that Basil has omitted, in the Apostle's Text, the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ—τοις ἁγιοις οὐσιν—και πιστοις ἐν Χριστῷ.

Plain as this circumstance is, nevertheless attempts have been made to involve it in difficulties, whence we are required to discuss it more profoundly. For these persons would rather conjecture some other peculiarity, than that which is expressed in Basil [n].

[m] Και γαρ που ἑτερωθι ὁ αὐτος οὑτος Ἀποστολος, ὁ ἐν Πνευματι Θεοῦ λαλων, μη ὀντα ὀνομαζει τα ἐθνη δια το της γνωσεως του Θεοῦ ἐστερησθαι, εἰπων ὁτι τα μη ὀντα ἐξελεξατο ὁ Θεος· ἐπι γαρ ὢν και ἀληθειᾳ και ζωῃ ὁ Θεος, οἱ τῳ Θεῳ τῳ ὀντι ἡνωμενοι κατα την πιστιν, τῃ δε ἀνυπαρξιᾳ του ψευδοῦς οἰκειωθεντες δια της περι τα εἰδωλα πλανης, εἰκοτως, οἰμαι, δια την στερησιν της ἀληθειας, και ἀπο της ζωης ἀλλοτριωσιν μη ὀντες προσεγορευθησαν. Ἀλλα και τοις Ἐφεσιοις ἐπιστελλων, ὡς γνησιως ἡνωμενοις τῳ ὀντι δι' ἐπιγνωσεως, ὀντας αὐτους ἰδιαζοντως ὠνομασεν, εἰπων· τοις ἁγιοις τοις οὐσι, και πιστοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὑτω γαρ και οἱ προ ἡμων παραδεδωκασι, και ἡμεις ἐν τοις παλαιοις των ἀντιγραφων εὑρηκαμεν.

[n] If it be therefore asked what Basil has said, we must examine the MSS. of his works; these are not at my command, but our library, rich in typographical antiquities, gives me a compensation, which sets us at rest on this point. The first Greek edition of Basil of 1538. fol. apud Froben. Basileæ per Des. Erasm. does

A learned man has wished to persuade us, that perhaps the word οὐσι in Paul's text, might have been omitted in some MSS., and that as this Father principally depended upon this expression, to establish the proof that the Apostle had called the Christians ὀντας, he might consequently have appealed to records and testimonies.

But if Basil was deficient only in this, he might very easily have supplied it by appealing to any other of Paul's Epistles:—to the Romans, Corinthians, Colossians, Philippians, where he would have found, as he wished, τοῖς οὐσιν ἐν Ῥωμῃ, τῃ ἐκκλησιᾳ τῃ οὐσῃ ἐν Κορινθῳ, τοῖς οὐσιν ἐν Φιλιπποις, τοῖς οὐσιν ἐν Κολοσσαις.

But the argument which Basil makes from Ephes. i. 1., is of such a nature, that he cannot have read the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, after τοῖς οὐσιν. For the question is of the predicate ὁ ὢν *absolutely* and in the sense in which it expresses the abstract idea of existence, and in which it belongs to God in the highest degree, and in every conceivable period of time; but, it is not in the sense of εἰμι, as far as it means to *remain or to dwell any where.* If then the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ belong to it, ὀντες can no

not contain the books against Eunomius. The editio princeps of these is therefore the Venetian of 1535. This however gives to us the passage, p. 127, just as I have quoted it. The secunda with regard to the writing against Eunomius appeared at Basil, *apud Froben.* 1551 in fol. with all his works. Janus Cornarius had edited the text, and as he certifies in his dedicatory letter to Julius, Bishop of Naumberg, προς παλαιοτατα ἀρχετυπα. This also exhibits to us the passage in the same manner, p. 668. Fronto Ducæus in his edition of this Father, Paris, 1618., and then Combefisius in his Basilius Magnus ex integro recensitus ex fide optimor. Cod. etc. Paris, 11 vol. in 8. 1679, found no deviation in the MSS.; and lastly also Garnier, who in the note L. ii. adv. Eunom. T. i. p. 254. has collected all the information on the subject, found no difference.

longer be considered as the communication of a Divine Attribute, from which he is called ὁ ὢν, as the author considers it; but ὀντες ἐν Ἐφεσῳ mean no more than those, who resided at Ephesus. We readily therefore perceive from the nature of his arguments, that he never could have read that, which is still wanting in every book cited by him [o].

A similar remark of Jerome on Ephesians i. 1., further confirms the fact, that ἐν Ἐφεσῳ was not invariably found in the text of the Apostle. He says, that some here so explain Paul, as if he had wished to name the believers from *Essentiæ vocabulo, ut ab eo,* QUI EST, QUI SUNT *appellentur:* others however maintain, that it was written not *ad eos* QUI SUNT, but *ad eos qui sunt Ephesi.*

The question therefore was, whether it was to be understood *ad eos* QUI SUNT, without any reference to place, which no one could ever have imagined, if the name of the place, *i. e,* if *qui sunt Ephesi,* had been expressed in the text: or whether it must necessarily be explained with reference to place, on which doubts could only arise, by the place being actually omitted in some copies [p].

Marcion had also (as Tertullian reproaches him)

[o] If we be disposed to infer from hence, that Basil had read the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ, because he quotes this Epistle as the Epistle to the Ephesians, τοις Ἐφεσιοις ἐπιστελλων, we must bear in mind, that he was forced to give to it some name, and that he gave to it that which it then usually bore; thus others also quote it, although they assert, that ἐν Ἐφεσῳ was originally wanting to it.

[p] Comment. in Ep. ad Ephes. Quidam curiosius, quam necesse est, putant ex eo, quod Mosi dictum sit: "Hæc dices filiis Israel, QUI EST misit me," etiam eos, qui Ephesi sunt, sancti et fideles, *Essentiæ vocabulo* nuncupatos, ut ab eo, QUI EST, hi QUI SUNT appellentur. Alii verò simpliciter, non ad *eos,* QUI SUNT, sed *qui Ephesi* sancti et fideles *sunt,* scriptum arbitrantur. Cf. not. Vallarsii, ad *h. l.*

altered the superscription of this Epistle (*titulum*) and prefixed to it the title AD LAODICENOS, contrary to the usage of the Church, according to which it was addressed AD EPHESIOS. Consequently, the words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ could not have been in the text, Ephes. i. 1, for otherwise the superscription would have contradicted the Epistle, or he would have been obliged to alter the words in the text itself, which Tertullian, who is not accustomed to overlook any thing in him, has not objected to him[q]. They are not indeed found in the text of the celebrated Vatican MS., but ἐν Ἐφεσῳ appears, although written by the first hand, only on the margin[r].

The Apostle also in this Epistle acts so unusually, and considers his readers as so unacquainted with his office and the object of his mission, that he assumes, merely as a conjecture, *that they might have heard, that he was the Apostle of the Gentiles, that God's gracious dispensation towards the Gentiles was committed to him, that he was qualified by especial revelations to instruct them, and that he was endowed with knowledge,* Ephes. iii. 1, 2, 3. But these Ephesians, whose church he had founded, with whom he had remained more than two years and a half, with each individual of whom he had become acquainted, and every one of whom (as he says) he had often admo-

[q] Tertull. l. v. adv. Marcion. c. 17. Ecclesiæ quidem veritate Epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos: sed Marcion ei *titulum* aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de *titulis* interest, cum ad omnes Apostolos scripserit, tum ad quosdam. And L. v. c. 11. Prætereo hic et de aliâ Epistolâ, quam nos *ad Ephesios* perscriptam habemus, hæretici vero ad *Laodicenos*. Cf. Koppe Nov. Test. perp. Annot. illustr. vol. vi. Prol. ad Ephes. p. 5. 7. ed. Tychsen.

[r] Hug, de Antiquitate Codicis Vaticani, p. 26.

nished with tears, Acts xx. 31. were not so unacquainted with him and his appointment.

The author of the Synopsis, which is found among the works of Athanasius, perceived indeed the unusual and general style of this Epistle, and concluded thence, notwithstanding the historical documents to the contrary, that Paul had not yet seen the Ephesians, when he wrote this Epistle, but was only acquainted with them from verbal accounts *.

Since then the Epistle has the name of no place at the commencement of it, like Paul's other Epistles, which were addressed to whole communities; since it is composed in such an unusual style, since altogether it is of so general a description, that it might have been written, not so much for the Ephesians in particular, as for several other churches in common, the solution of Archbishop Usher is by far the best which we have, as to the destination and object of this treatise. He considers it as a circular Epistle, which was equally intended for several communities of Asia Minor. On this account the name of the place was left vacant, that the reader might insert it, according to the church in which it was read: Παυλος Ἀποστολος ι. χ. δια θεληματος Θεου τοις ἁγιοις τοῖς οὐσι . . . . . και πιστοις. λ.

Yet it must have appeared, among Paul's writings, under some particular name, about which they must have been generally agreed, lest any uncertainty respecting it, or any arrogance of those, who might claim the peculiar honor of having received it, should occasion an interruption in the collection or in the canon. Accordingly, the title προς τους Ἐφησιους was given to it, either because Ephesus was the most

* Ταυτην προς Ἐφεσιους ἐπιστελλει ἀπο Ῥωμης, οὔπω μεν αὐτους ἑωρακως, ἀκουσας δε μονον περι αὐτων.

eminent of the Asiatic cities, or was the first which had received it[1], Ephes. v. 19. 2 Tim. iv. 12. The words ἐν Ἐφεσῳ were thus, in process of time, inserted into the text itself, and were admitted, as the superscription testifies, into several MSS.

SECTION CXVI.

THE contents are as follow:—Paul, at the commencement, extols the value and pre-eminence of Christianity, the dignity of its founder, and proclaims

[1] Michaelis also subscribes to this opinion of the Archbishop, which I conceive to be the true one. Mr. Valpy, in his New Testament, suggests another explanation: "But the most probable opi-" nion is, that the Apostle sent the Ephesians word by Tychicus, " who carried their letter, to send a copy of it to the Laodiceans, " with an order to them to communicate it to the Colossians, see " Col. iv. 16. This hypothesis will account, as well as that of " Michaelis, for the want of those marks of personal acquaintance, " which the Apostle's former residence at Ephesus might lead us " to expect; for every thing local would be purposely omitted in an " Epistle which had a further destination. If ever there was a " letter from St. Paul to the Laodiceans distinct from the present, it " is lost." But if ἐν Ἐφεσῳ was wanting to many ancient codices, this opinion by no means explains the singularity in τοις οὐσι, for we can attach no force to the absurd interpretations, which Basil and Jerome have preserved; the only adequate explanation therefore is Usher's, to which strong presumptive support may be derived from Col. iv. 16, και ὁταν ἀναγνωϑῃ παρ' ὑμιν ἡ ἐπιστολη, ποιησατε ἱνα και ἐν τῃ Λαοδικεων ἐκκλησιᾳ ἀναγνωϑῃ· και την ἐκ Λαοδικειας ἱνα και ὑμεις ἀναγνωτε, which completely establishes the interchange of Epistles, on which the argument rests. The substance of Hug's disquisition seems to have been extracted from Peirce's commentary, who advances somewhat further, and supposes the Ephesian church, as the metropolitan, to have claimed this circular Epistle after the Apostle's death, to the probability of which nothing is opposed. That wretched production, bearing the title of the Epistle to the Laodiceans in Fabricius, is most manifestly spurious.—*Translator.*

the benefits which those, to whom the Epistle is addressed, have received from him,—iii. He then refers to himself as the envoy of this universal Benefactor, he mentions his chains, which he bears principally on account of the Gentiles, and he exhorts them to become more and more steadfast in the dignified doctrine of the Gospel,—iv. After these preparations he recommends to them union in doctrine and the outward worship of God, and informs them, that however different be the appointment of individual members in the church, all this only tends to ensure the greater union of the whole,—iv. 17. He then passes to their conduct, and desires that it may be worthy of their great vocation, he speaks of improvement, meekness, concord, and benevolence,—v. He extends his discourse farther to the impurity and other vices of Paganism.

From chap. v. 21.—vi. 10. he treats of the duties of the married and domestic state; of the husband, of the wife, of children, and of domestics. In conclusion, he enjoins them once more to remain stedfast in the then dangerous state of Christianity, and greets them.

SECTION CXVII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

Colossæ was one of the principal cities of Phrygia, concerning which the ancients have preserved to us but few accounts. It was destroyed by an earthquake (soon after Paul had written to it,) in the latter part of Nero's reign [x]. In some MSS. it

[x] Plin. Hist. N. L. v. c. 41: Oros. Hist. L. viii. c. 7. Xenophon de Expedit. Cyri, L. i. c. 2. n. 6. praises Κολοσιας, πολιν οἰκουμενην, εὐδαιμονα και μεγαλην.

is also called Colassæ, and this reading was so much approved, that many only quoted it thus. But the coins of this city are stamped ΚΟΛΟΣΣΗΝΟΙ, and ΔΗΜΟΣ ΚΟΛΟΣΣΗΝΩΝ.

Paul himself had not taught here: they became acquainted with Christianity, probably, only by means of his disciples, and with himself only from verbal accounts. One of their principal teachers was Epaphras, whom false preachers endeavoured to render suspected. The Apostle however sanctioned him by his authority, and answered for him and his doctrines, Coloss. i. 7.; iv. 12, 13.

SECTION CXVIII.

Paul wrote this Epistle immediately after that to the Ephesians, after Timothy had joined him at Rome, Coloss. i. 1, which consolation he could not have enjoyed, when he wrote the former, as we have remarked in its place. Tychicus carried both Epistles to Asia, but at different times: first that to the Ephesians, and the second to Timothy, as I imagine, 2 Tim. iv. 12, then that to the Colossians and to Philemon; the two first at the beginning of his imprisonment, before Paul was examined (for soon after his examination his prospects were cloudy and dark, as he describes them to his friend Timothy) and the two last in the following year, when his fate gradually brightened. For, in the Epistle to Philemon, which was dispatched with that to the Colossians, the Apostle expects his speedy liberation, and gives to his friend hopes, that he might soon be able to visit him, Philem. v. 22. These are the combined circumstances, which I consider correct

with regard to the time when these compositions were sent, on which subject I shall corroborate my assertions more fully in treating of the second Epistle to Timothy.

SECTION CXIX.

At the beginning of the Epistle he praises their faith, their love, and the instructions of Epaphras, and assures them of his prayers on their behalf. He then extols the mercies of Jesus Christ, and describes him as Creator, Lord of the spiritual world, and of all things existent, and as the enlightener of the Gentiles,—i. 24. He then proceeds to speak of himself, as an ambassador of Jesus and of his chains, which he bears on account of the Gospel and those who honour it, as well as of those whom he has not personally seen, and takes occasion from his own sufferings to exhort them to remain in an unshaken fidelity to their first instruction, and on their guard against heresy,—ii. 12. Hereupon he represents to them, that being, by baptism, symbolically buried with Jesus, dead to the follies of human speculations, they should, having assumed a new character, now raise their spirit higher, that they should strive in life and actions after that which is celestial, and diligently study to maintain innocence and sincerity, forbearance and meekness,—iii. 18.

He then treats of the duties of married women, of husbands, of children, and of domestics, and exhorts them to prayer. The conclusion is composed of salutations, with an order to communicate the Epistle to the Laodiceans, and to read that of Laodicea at Colossæ.

SECTION CXX.

ON THE EPISTLE TO THE LAODICEANS.

We are in the possession of an Epistle addressed to the Laodiceans and recommended with the name of Paul [y]. It does not require a great philological knowledge, or insight into the higher branches of criticism to pass sentence on this botchery. The antients, as far as they lead us back to the times of primitive Christianity, knew nothing of value under this name, nor any work which was worthy of their attention, or on which they might have merely taken the pains of raising one forbearing doubt [z].

Some have even labored to substantiate the existence of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, at a former time; although Paul seems to assure us of the fact, Coloss. iv. 16. He says, in this passage to the Colossians; "*when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea,* και την εκ Λαοδικειας, ινα και υμεις αναγνωτε."

Chrysostom and Theodoret remark in their commentaries on this verse, that some understand by this an Epistle, which the Church of Laodicea had written to the Apostle. For, the expression την εκ Λαοδικειας, signifies, *that from Laodicea,* NOT *that to the Laodiceans,* την προς τους Λαοδικεις. Several are of the same opinion.

The words may however signify both, and contain

[y] Fabric. Cod. Apoc. N. T. P. II. p. 853. P. III. 710.

[z] Anonym. apud Murator. Antiqq. Ital. med. ævi. T. iii. p. 853. Hieronym. Script. Eccles. v. Paulus.

in either case a very harsh ellipsis. Cause the Epistle to be brought to you from Laodicea, WHICH THEY HAVE RECEIVED FROM ME; or, cause the Epistle to be brought to you from Laodicea, *which they have written to me.*

But if it was no mutual exchange of two Apostolical Epistles; and if ἡ ἐκ Λαοδικειας means an Epistle, which the Laodiceans had sent to the [a] Apostle; why does Paul command, that they should also communicate to the Colossians this Epistle which had been addressed to him? Was it perhaps with the intention of representing the Laodiceans to the Colossians as their teachers, and of giving their views as an example and guide to the Colossians? If we are not able to persuade ourselves to this, it can only be, because one Epistle had reference to the contents of the other, and was necessary to the comprehension of it.

The matter of Paul's Epistle to the Colossians must consequently have been of such a nature, as not to be understood without that, which the Lao-

[a] The passage to which Hug alludes in Theodoret, is, *οὐκ ἐφη την προς Λαοδικεας, ἀλλα την ἐκ Λαοδικειας· ἐκεινοι γαρ προς αὐτον περι τινων ἐγραψαν· εἰκος δε αὐτους ἡ τα ἐν Κολοσσαις γενομενα αἰτιασασθαι ἡ τα αὐτα τουτοις νενοσηκεναι. Διο και ταυτην εἰπε την ἐπιστολην κἀκεινοις ἀναγνωσθῆναι.* From some such a prevalent idea the Syrian translator rendered the passage, ⟨Syriac⟩ The Coptic translator has merely copied the Greek ⟨Coptic⟩, and of course is equally elliptical and indefinite. One MS., however, reads *και ἡ ἐκ Λαοδικειας ὑμιν ἀναγινωσκηται*, which is certainly more probable, than the barbarism of the present passage, although we must not admit it from want of support from other respectable sources. The Æthiopic also seems as decisive, ⟨Ethiopic⟩ for although the Latin translator renders the words, *et etiam Laodicenses*, we should rather conceive them to mean *et etiam Laodicensium*, i. e. *Laodicensem.*—*Translator.*

diceans had before sent to the Apostle, and that on this account, it was requisite that the one should be read with the other.

But it is then surprising, that Paul should have written to the Colossians, what related properly to the Laodiceans—it is surprising that he returns no answer to the Laodiceans, who had certainly not written to him without a cause; that he wrote to the one what they did not understand, and did not write to the others who could understand him.

The Epistle to the Colossians, after all, is not so arranged as to refer to a preceding Epistle from any person whatever: it merely refers to verbal accounts.

It refers to that which the Apostle had heard concerning the state of affairs in this Church, Coloss. i. 3. ἀκουσαντες, and expressly names Epaphras, δηλωσας λ. i. 8, 9., who had given to him the information respecting them.

It therefore contradicts itself in every respect, as to an Epistle of the Laodiceans having been received by the Apostle, with especial reference to which he might have composed that to the Colossians, and we must pronounce την ἐκ Λαοδικειας to have been an Epistle of Paul, which he had written to that place, and which was to be communicated from Laodicea to the Colossians, as these were also required to attend to the same things.

But where now is this Epistle? Whence was it lost at such an early period, as for all antiquity to have ceased to recollect it? How could that to the Laodiceans have perished, whilst that to the Colossians has been preserved? if the Laodiceans exposed their's to destruction and decay, we perceive, that the Colossians have transmitted their own to posterity; and if, indeed, that to Laodicea had come into these careful hands, it must naturally have been saved with it.

These difficulties which are as forcible as true cannot be better solved than by the ingenious hypothesis of Hugo Grotius, who (as far as I know) proposed it the first. For he considers the Epistle to the Laodiceans to be the same, which now bears the address to the Ephesians. This was directed to several Churches in Asia Minor, and principally to those, which had not seen the Apostle, among which he even reckons the Laodiceans, Coloss. ii. 1.; it had, according to Marcion, the title, προς τους Λαοδικεις, and was therefore particularly destined for the Laodiceans, as it was imagined in the ancient times; for, that Marcion here intended an erudite display, rather than a falsification, we may easily perceive, if we merely consider that in this instance there can be no motive for the latter. Moreover the situation of the places was such, that the Colossians might be most conveniently referred thither, for the purpose of procuring a sight of the Epistle to the Ephesians, as it is called. The hypothesis has therefore not only the advantage of explaining the above difficulties, but likewise that of having a peculiar internal probability.

SECTION CXXI.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

The Apostle was visited in Rome by Onesimus, a fugitive slave of Philemon; he won him, improved him, and sent him back with a recommendation to his master. Although Paul assisted the possessor to recover a property which was then by no means of little value, and had moreover the merit of restoring it to the owner better than when he had lost it; al-

though the services of such a man at Rome must have been extremely acceptable to the Apostle, and although the terms of friendship on which he was with his master seem to have entitled him to such a right; he nevertheless sent back the fugitive with all the delicacy of polished society, and gave him a recommendation to his proprietor.

Thy faith, Philemon, (he wrote to him,) and thy love are pre-eminently adapted to console me. I send to thee with this the fugitive, whom I won and improved, in my prison. Willingly as I would have retained him to have administered to me in this place, I would not however do so without thy permission. Receive him, forgive him, treat him as a brother, for such he has become in Christ. I hope soon to see thee, and greet thee with all those, who are with me.

This Epistle and that to the Colossians were sent at the same time, when Onesimus returned to his master. Philem. x. 11. Coloss. iv. 7, 8, 9. In both Epistles the same persons were in company with the Apostle, and attendant on him, viz. Timothy, Aristarchus, also, who was a fellow-prisoner with Paul, Mark, Luke, Demas, and Epaphras, Philem. 23. Coloss. iv. 10. 12. 14.

SECTION CXXII.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

This, as I imagine, was written during Paul's first imprisonment at Rome, after the Epistle to the Ephesians, and before those to the Colossians and Philemon; but learned men decide it to have been

written during the second Roman imprisonment, the incidents of which are quite unknown to us. As we might expect from their knowledge and learning, they are in no way deficient in arguments for their assertion.

It is certain, that the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon, were written during the first Roman imprisonment; and it is equally sure, that they were composed in the order already mentioned. For there are circumstances in them, which individualize the first imprisonment, and which we must apply to a comparison with those, which we find in the second Epistle to Timothy.

At the commencement of the imprisonment, when the Epistle to the Ephesians was written, Timothy who also does not appear to have been among Paul's travelling companions to Rome, (Acts xxvii. 2.) was not with him, for he does not add his name in the title, which he was always accustomed to do, when he was with him. Timothy joined him at a later period, and in the introduction to the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, his name stands by the side of that of the Apostle, Coloss. i. 1. Philem. i. secondly, Luke was in the company of Paul, Colos. iv. 14, Philem. 24; thirdly, Mark, according to the indication of the two latter Epistles, was also with him, Coloss. iv; fourthly, Tychicus was at that time a letter-bearer and a deacon, and was sent especially to Asia, Ephes. iv. 21. Coloss. iv. 7, 8.

All these circumstances appear again in the second Epistle to Timothy. He was not at first with Paul; but was summoned by him, 2 Tim. iv. 9. 21; secondly, Luke was with him, 2 Tim. iv; thirdly, he also desires Mark to come with Timothy, so that he must have been with him during the course of his imprisonment;

fourthly, Tychicus was present as the letter-bearer, and was sent especially to Asia, 2 Tim. iv. 11, 12.

Now if Paul had written the second Epistle to Timothy during his second imprisonment at Rome, we must suppose both to have been written under precisely the same circumstances; we must suppose that Timothy each time was not at first with the Apostle, but joined him later, that Mark was present each time as well as Luke; that each time Tychicus was there, as a letter-bearer, and was sent to Asia.

But we must also suppose that Paul, each time, even during the latter days of Nero, was permitted to receive friends in his prison, to write letters, send messengers, and keep up constantly a free intercourse with men.

Yet even this was only a fortunate circumstance in his first imprisonment, which could never have taken place without the kind and friendly disposition of the centurion Julius towards him, Acts xxviii. 16. cf. xxvii. 3. The *custodia libera* or ἀδέσμος was only granted by official persons to very respectable Romans. The *custodia apud vates* could only be granted under particular cases, the validity of which must have been recognised. In the *custodia militaris* the prisoner was put under the care of a centurion, and chained to a soldier. Can we easily imagine, what any one could have written in such a situation, how any one could receive and send letters and messengers, unless a particular favor of the centurion communicated the means? Nevertheless in the better days of Nero this was the sort of imprisonment which fell to the lot of the Apostle. But if he had been sentenced to a harder lot, to the *Carcer*, as was to be feared in those days, when no ill treatment seemed bad enough for Christians, he would have

been fortunate in not being obliged to renounce the light of day [b].

The *custodia militaris*, was (as we have said,) the lot of the Apostle. Julius, after his arrival at Rome, resigned the charge of the prisoners to the *Præfectus prætorio*, Στρατοπεδαρχης. At the commencement of the eighth year of Nero, Burrhus was still the person, after whose death two were appointed to this office, Fenius Rufus and Sophonius Tigellinus. Tacitus mentions the death of Burrhus in the eighth year of Nero. The decease of this confessedly upright man occasioned the greater consternation, as little good was expected from the sluggish harmlessness of the one of his successors, and from the insatiable depravity of the other, who, in the sequel, acquired the whole confidence of Nero and an exorbitance of power. Seneca soon felt the altered air of the court, and retired after the death of his friend in this year, which he calls in his address to the Emperor the eighth of his reign [c].

The Apostle was allowed to dwell by himself, with the soldier who guarded him, Acts xxviii. 16. This distinction was a favor of an unusual nature. A great deal however depended yet on the kind disposition of the centurion, who had the charge of him, and of the alternate guard, to whom he was chained. Finally, the free intercourse with others, as Paul enjoyed it, was an exception, for which few could hope.

How difficult it must have been to obtain such privileges under a change of circumstances, we learn from the example of Herod Agrippa, who was indebted to the patronage of the highest favor at Court for a kind

[b] Lipsius in not. ad Tacit. Ann. L. v. c. 3. and in excursu B. ad Tacit. Ann. L. iii.

[c] Tacit. Annal. L. xiv. c. 53.

centurion being placed in charge over him by the *Præfectus prætorio*, and for being chained to less brutal guards, who connived at the visits of a few friends, and the obtainment of some comforts during the night and darkness [d].

SECTION CXXIII.

However clearly a similar state and series of circumstances point to one and the same imprisonment, yet there are in the Epistle some declarations, which do not at all accord with the first imprisonment at Rome. So say the learned, who transfer the composition of this writing to the second imprisonment.

Paul mentions Erastus with the addition, *he remained at Corinth, but Trophimus* (says he) *I have left sick at Miletus*, 2 Tim. iv. 20. This is a route quite different to that, which Luke sketches of the first journey to Rome. In this journey Paul sailed towards Sidon, thence to Cyprus on the coast of Cilicia by Pamphilia and Lycia, was driven to Crete and came not, by ten German miles, to Miletus, and so far was he from coming to Corinth, that the storm rather drove him in the direction of Africa, and forced him to [e] Malta, Acts xxvii. 3.—xxviii.

But Paul does not say here, that he came to Corinth, but that Erastus had remained there, where he was an official personage, ἐμεινε ἐν Κορινθῳ. This he could also have said, if Erastus who was expected before him according to promise or in

[d] Joseph. Antiq. L. xviii. c. 6. § 7.

[e] Whether Malta be or not the Μελιτη in Acts xxviii. 1. has been a question equally disputed. The reader is referred to the numerous dissertations on the subject.—*Translator.*

consequence of friendly intimacy, contrary to his expectation had not arrived.

With regard to Trophimus, the matter would have been more important, if the passage merely said, *I left him sick at Miletus.* It thus runs: Τροφιμον ἀπελιπον ἐν Μιλητῳ ἀσθενοῦντα, which words also mean *they have left Trophimus sick at Miletus.*

For many deputies were sent with support to the Apostle from several churches; as *amici* and *deprecatores*, whose duty it was, according to the Greek and Roman customs, to attend the accused *in causâ capitali* at the trial, 2 Tim. iv. 16. The duty of a friend of supporting a friend at his trial was sacred to the Romans, and still more so to the Christians. We see Lucian ironically describing the zeal of the Christians, how they, when any of their teachers lay in prison, sent deputies to comfort and assist him at his trial from the cities in Asia, at the expence of the community [f]. Epaphroditus Philip. iv. 18. Epaphras, Coloss. iv. 12, 13. Onesiphorus, 2 Tim. i. 16, 17, came in this capacity. Others came from Asia, who however pusillanimously left the Apostle to his fate, 2 Tim. i. 15. Thus, Erastus should have come from Corinth, individually as the friend, or as commissioned by the community, from which Paul had deserved so very much.

Trophimus however, in particular, should have appeared. At the first imprisonment he was an indispensable person, having been the occasion of Paul's apprehension, Acts xxi. 29. According to the Roman laws, the witnesses on both sides were to be examined personally, for the determination of a

[f] Και μην και των ἐν Ἀσιᾳ πολεων ἐστιν, ἀν ἡκον τινες των Χριστιανων στελλοντων ἀπο του κοινου, βοηθησοντες, και ξυναγορευσοντες και παραμυθησομενοι τον ἀνδρα. De Morte Peregrin. §. 13. T. viii. p. 280. Bipont.

question, and in this case the chief point of accusation against him depended WHETHER HE WAS A HEATHEN? AND WHETHER PAUL COULD BE ACCUSED OF HAVING BROUGHT HEATHENS INTO THE TEMPLE? If he then travelled in company with his fellow-countrymen the Asiatics, who were sent to the Apostle, and became ill, the passage has the natural signification, *they left*[s] *Trophimus at Miletus sick*, which was an accident which not a little delayed the examination and sentence of Paul.

We know not whether he was also implicated in the affairs relative to the second imprisonment; but it is certain, that in the first he was bound to appear at the trial. The objection inferred respecting him, therefore, even confirms that, which it might have been expected to have contradicted.

To the first imprisonment, also, Alexander is to

[s] In this, as well as in many other instances, Hug seems rather desirous of drawing an ingenious argument from uncertain data, than of previously satisfying himself of the solidity of the foundation, on which his theories are erected. It is true, that ἀπελιπον independently of that which may precede it, is as referable to the third person plural as to the first person singular: but the authority of the different versions, the style of the context, in which the Apostle is speaking of himself (*e. g.* vers. 12. ἀπεστειλα—13. ἀπελιπον), and the fair presumption that some allusion would have been made to these supposed deputies, had they constituted the nominative ἀπελιπον, are at direct variance with Hug's hypothesis. The Epistle itself bears marks of having been written during his second imprisonment, for at iv. 16, 17. he mentions his πρωτη ἀπολογια, and delivery from Nero's tyranny (και ἐῤῥυσθην ἐκ στοματος λεοντος) from which he immediately passes (ix. 18.) not to his temporal deliverance, but to his approaching reward on high. Cf. ix. 6, 7, 8. Thus, Eusebius H. E. L. ii. c. 22. writes, δευτερον δ' ἐπιβαντα τῃ αὐτῃ πολει, τῳ κατ' αὐτον τελειωθηναι μαρτυριῳ, ἐν ᾧ δεσμοις ἐχομενος την προς Τιμοθεον δευτεραν ἐπιστολην συνταττει, ὁμου σημαινων, την τε προτεραν αὐτῳ γενομενην ἀπολογιαν, και την παραποδας τελειωσιν, κ. τ. λ., where he has substantiated his assertion from the manifest authority of the Epistle.—*Translator.*

be referred, who, in the uproar at Ephesus, had been put forward as a speaker by the Jews, Acts xix. 33, and now violently prosecutes the Apostle before the Roman tribunal[h], 2 Tim. iv. 14, 15. They could not have consigned the event to an old, half-forgotten history, if they were desirous of bringing him before the tribunal, but must have availed themselves of the first favorable opportunity, and have appeared, when the process was instituted against the Apostle. For it was uncertain, if a second opportunity would ever occur. In those later and tumultuous times, in which Paul's second imprisonment occurs, they scarcely summoned witnesses and accusers from distant parts of the empire, and scarcely prolonged the examinations through one or two years, that so long a time might be allowed to all, who were desirous of accusing him, to appear at Rome.

The second Epistle to Timothy was therefore written during the first imprisonment at Rome, and immediately after the Epistle to the Ephesians, and before that to the Colossians. The Apostle in this

[h] Hug, without any proof, identifies the Alexander mentioned in this Epistle with the Alexander whom the Jews selected to plead their cause before the Ephesian populace. Nor does it appear, that this Alexander entertained any particular animosity against the Apostle; for from a name, which so commonly prevailed, we cannot argue, without far more determinate documents, to the identity of an individual. He was intended to have been the ἐκβιβαστης of the Jews; but it does not necessarily follow, that he was to have been the accuser of the Apostle. Alexander ὁ χαλκευς was most probably a different person, for we can perceive no connection between them, and it does not positively appear, that he was one of Paul's accusers: for the imputation against him was, that he had rendered to him many evil offices (πολλα κακα ἐνεδειξατο) to define the nature of which it is now absolutely impossible. We cannot therefore admit *mere tradition* or *hypothesis* in an enquiry into the date and scope of this Epistle.—*Translator.*

Epistle very urgently sends for Timothy, but when the Epistle to the Ephesians was dispatched, he was not yet with him; in the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, he had indeed arrived. The Epistles to the Ephesians and to Timothy went both to Asia, and were probably dispatched by one and the same opportunity.

In the Epistle to Timothy his prospects are yet gloomy and doubtful; he has every where the prospect of a sad issue, and little appearance of liberation before him: but in that to Philemon, which was sent together with that to the Colossians, he has indeed a hope of delivery, and promises a visit to Philemon.

SECTION CXXIV.

The contents of the Epistle to Timothy are these: I think often of thee, and wish with very great anxiety to see thee; be not thou ashamed of me, nor of the Gospel for which I am in bonds. Many have deserted me, thou wilt not do so: have courage, teach steadfastly as I do; I live and die for Jesus, that I may reign with him, ii. 14. Engage in no strifes nor overlearned disputations; be, above all things, a worthy, meek, patient teacher, iii. 1. But take heed: know that a pernicious race of heretics will arise, therefore adhere thou so much the more to pure doctrine, remain true to thy first instruction, watch, be careful, be unremittingly attentive for the sake of Jesus, iv. 6. I am already devoted to the sacrifice; hasten thou to me. All have abandoned me, and bitter accusers have risen up against me; nevertheless the Lord will yet be able to effect my deliverance.

SECTION CXXV.

CONCERNING THE HERETICS AGAINST WHOM THE EPISTLES TO THE EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND TO TIMOTHY ARE DIRECTED.

WITHOUT being acquainted with the notions of those teachers, who caused the Apostle so much anxiety and so much vexation, a considerable part of these treatises must necessarily remain dark and unintelligible. An introduction, stating the historical and critical preliminary knowledge, which must be provided to explain them, is therefore connected with this investigation.

From the criteria, by which the Apostle points them out, at one time some deemed, that they recognized the Gnostics; others perceived none but the Essenes, and every one found arguments for his assertions from the similarity of the doctrines, opinions and morals. It would however be as difficult to prove that the Gnostic school had at that time indeed perfectly developed itself, as it is unjust to charge the Essenes with that extreme of immorality of which Paul accused these seducers, since the cotemporaries and acquaintances of this Jewish sect mention them with honour and respect, and extol its members as the most virtuous men of their age.

The similarity of the principles and opinions, which will have been observed in both parties compared with Paul's declarations, flows from a common source, from the philosophy of that age, whence both the one and the other have derived their share. We shall therefore go less astray, if we recede a step, and consider the philosophy itself, as the general modeller of these derivative theories. It found its fol-

lowers among Judaism as well as among the heathens; both introduced its speculative preparations into Christianity, and endeavoured to unite them or to adjust them to it, as well as they were able, by which means Christianity would have become deformed and unlike to itself, and would have been merged in the ocean of philosophical reveries, unless the Apostles had on this occasion defended against the follies of men that, which they had acquired at the expence of blood and life opposed to violence.

An Oriental, or (as it is commonly called) a Babylonian or Chaldæan doctrinal system had already long become known to the Greeks, and even to the Romans before Augustus, and still more so in the Augustan age, and was in the full progress of its extension over Asia and Europe. It set up different Deities[i] and intermediate spirits in explanation of certain phænomena of nature,—for the office of governing the world and for the solution of other metaphysical questions, which from time immemorial, were reckoned among the difficult propositions of philosophy. The practical part of this system was occupied with the precepts, by means of which a person might enter into communication with these spirits or Dæmons. But the result, which they promised to themselves from this union with the Divine natures, was that of acquiring by their assistance superhuman knowledge, that of predicting future events and of performing supernatural works[k]. These philosophers were celebrated under the name of [l]Magi and Chaldeans, who, for the sake of better

[i] Cf. Brucker Kleuker, Görres et Creutzer, *passim.*—*Translator.*

[k] Diodor. Sic. L. ii. c. 29, 30, 31. p. 142—4. Wessel.

[l] Wetstein has shown, in his observations on the second chapter of Matthew, the interchange of the terms Μαγοι and Χαλδαιοι by the Greeks. But, the pure Magian philosophy appears to have been

accommodating themselves to the Western Nations, modified their system after the Greek forms, and then (as it appears) knew how to unite it with the doctrine of Plato from whence afterwards arose the Neo-Platonic and in Christendom the Gnostical school.

These men forced their way even to the throne. Tiberius had received instruction in their philosophy, and was very confident that by means of an intelligence with the Dæmons, it was possible to learn

free from these pretensions, nor was it until later times, that præternatural agency was imputed to it. مغ according to the native Lexica of the Persians was but the generic name of the آتش پرستان or fire-worshippers, although the Greeks seem to have applied to the ancient Magi of the Persians the superstitions and cabbalistical practices of other fire-worshippers settled in Babylonia. Our slight acquaintance with the Zend renders its etymology uncertain: but, the Sanscrit, to which it was allied, probably contains it in the root मह *to worship*. Wilson supposes मघ to be derived from this root, "affix. कन् and ह changed to घ." मह as a noun means a *festival, sacrifice*, &c. and महस in addition to these senses implies *knowledge*. मघ was also the name of one of the Dwipas of the Universe. Hence مغ would according to this derivation signify a *worshipper*, as the Farhangi Jehangiri interprets it. The Berhani Katteā has given to us many evidences, that the more ancient language contained a considerable relation between the ز and غ: thus, میغ a cloud, मेघ in Sanskrit, was likewise written ميز, which, aided by the rules of Sanskrit orthography, will satisfy us that it is very possible for مغ to have proceeded from मह.

But, Hug is decidedly wrong in supposing them to have accommodated their doctrine to the Westerns:—for, the Greeks on their return from their travels to Ægypt and other places are well known to have accommodated their philosophy to oriental reveries, and it was not until the dominion of the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, that the Grecian philosophy was circulated among the Asiatics, or that any re-action could have taken place. This date, however, does not controvert his arguments respecting Paul's Epistles: it merely corrects the error of his statement.—*Translator*.

and perform extraordinary things [m]. Nero caused a great number of them to be brought over from Asia, not unfrequently at the expence of the provinces. The supernatural [n] spirits would not always appear, yet he did not discard his belief of them [o].

The Magi and Chaldæans were the persons, who were consulted on great undertakings, who, when conspiracies arose, predicted the issue, who invoked spirits, prepared offerings [p], and in love-affairs were obliged to afford aid from their art [q]. Even the force of the laws, to which recourse was frequently necessary to be had at Rome, tended to nothing but the augmentation of their authority [r].

As they found access and favour with people of all classes in the Capital, so did they also in the provinces. Paul found a Magus at the court of

[m] Dio Cass. L. lvii. p. 419. Rob. Steph. Cf. also concerning his teacher Trasyllus, Juvenal, Sat. vi. 575. Tacit. Ann. L. vi. c. 20. 1. Gronov. Juvenal, Sat. x. 93.

Principis Augustâ Caprearum in rupe sedentis
Cum grege Chaldæo.

[n] These dogmata originated in ill-understood notions of the Persian Amshaspands and Furuhers, and although the Oneirocritic and Haruspicial arts were studied by the Magi, the earliest Eastern records no where attach to them the study of magical preparations. In Mohammedan tales alone we find the Aspersion in the East, at which we need not be surprised, when we recollect Mohammed's virulence against the Gabr, and the almost hereditary aversion, which prevails between him and the Moslem. But (as we have before observed) since the Greeks made no distinction between the ancient Persian مغل and the fire-worshippers, diviners, &c. of other regions, assigning to each order a Zerdusht or Zoroaster as its founder, it is very apparent, whence the stigma originated.—*Translator.*

[o] Plin. Hist. Nat. L. xxx. c. 2.

[p] Tacit. Ann. L. ii. c. 27.

[q] Philo de Legg. special. p. 542. Ed. Turneb.

[r] Tacit. Ann. L. ii. c. 32. Sueton. in Vitell. 14. Juvenal Sat. vi. 556—560.

the Proconsul at Paphos [s], Acts xiii. 6. Such was that Simon in Samaria, Acts viii. 9., who was there considered as a Higher being of the spiritual class. The expression is remarkable, as it is a part of the technical language of the Theurgists; *they called him* Α ΔΥΝΑΜΙΣ του Θεου μεγαλη. So also Pliny calls some of the Dæmons and intermediate spirits, by whose co-operation particular results were effected: —HE CALLS THEM POTESTATES [t].

Justin Martyr, the fellow-countryman of Simon, has preserved to us some technical expressions of his followers. He says that they ascribed to him the high title ὑπερανω πασης ἀρχης, και ἐξουσιας, και δυναμεως [u].

Of these classes of spirits, which appear under such different appellations, the superior were those who ruled: but the inferior, who had more of a ma-

[s] From Luke's use of μαγος in the xiiith. ch. of the Acts it is manifest, that he referred it to the student of occult sciences, not to a Magus properly so called.....'Ελυμας ὁ Μαγος (οὑτω γαρ μεθερμηνευεται το ὀνομα αὐτου)—Μαγος, therefore, was the interpretation of 'Ελυμας, which we consequently suppose to have been عالم or عيلم: for, that it could not be the interpretation of Bar Jesus, is certain, because Bar Jesus clearly means the *Son of Jesus*. The Syriac, however, reads the name ܒܪ ܫܘܡܐ *Bar Shumo*, and the Æthiopic ጥርሻዕ: *Tarishā*. Bar Jesus was therefore the name of the individual—Elymas, interpreted μαγος in Greek, was the title of his scientific profession: but from the Arabic designation, which he bore, we perceive that he had no analogy to the real مغ, or Gabr. In c. viii. Simon is represented as μαγευων, by which direct allusion is made to the arts then believed to be practised: consequently, neither have the relation to the Persian order, on which Hug seems to insist. He appears to have been addicted to the Cabbalistical philosophy then in vogue.—*Translator*.

[t] Plin. Hist. Nat. L. xxix. c. 4. Sanguinem (Basliscī) Magi miris laudibus celebrant .... tribuunt ei successus petitionum à Potestatibus et a Diis.

[u] Dialog. cum Tryph. Ed. Rob. Steph. p. 115.

terial substance, and who on that account were able to connect themselves immediately with matter, were those, who executed the commands of the superior [x].

By an intelligence with the superior spirits a person might have the subaltern at his service and assistance; for, the more powerful Dæmons thus commanded the inferior (ἐν τῳ ἀρχοντι των Δαιμονιων, Matth. xii. 24.) to execute certain commissions in the material world [y].

The Syrian philosopher Jamblichus of Chalcis has furnished us with a circumstantial representation of this system and its several varieties in his book ON THE MYSTERIES OF THE CHALDÆANS AND EGYPTIANS. I am indeed aware, that some have deemed this work not to be his [z]; but even if it be the work of any Neo-Platonic, it gives to us, at all events, the advantage of finding here collected and compiled all these absurdities which we were obliged to seek, as they lay scattered in many other writings. From it therefore we extract the short sketch of this extraordinary system, as it was modelled, after its introduction among the Greeks—which we here produce.

The nature of the Gods (such are the chief ideas of this theory) is a pure, spiritual, and perfect unity. With this highest and perfect immateriality no in-

[x] Neque enim ipsos (Deos) à curâ rerum humanarum, sed à contrectatione solâ removi .... cæterum sunt quædam divinæ mediæ potestates, δυναμεις, etc. Apuleii, de Gen. Socrat. p. 229. Bipont.

[y] Quæ cuncta cœlestium voluntate et numine et auctoritate, sed Dæmonum obsequio et ministerio fieri arbitrandum est. Apuleii. l. c. p. 230.

[z] Chr. Meiners judicium de libro, qui de mysteriis .... Jamblicho vindicari solet, in comment. Soc. reg. Goetting. ad A. 1781. Cl. Philol. p. 50. The passage (Schol. in Plat. in Anecd. Græc. Siebenkees. p. 21. Norimb. 1798,) may be considered as a new testimony in favour of Jamblichus, which has since been produced.

fluence on matter is conceivable, consequently no creation and dominion of the world [a].

Certain subordinate deities must therefore be admitted, which are more compounded in their nature and can act upon gross matter. These are the creators of the world, δημιουργοι, and the rulers of the world κοσμοκρατορες [b].

The superior Deities are however the real cause of all that exists, and from their fulness, from their πληρωμα, it derives its existence [c].

The succession from the highest Deities down to the lowest is not by a sudden descent but by a continually graduating decrease from the highest, pure, and spiritual nature, down to [d] those which are more substantial and material, which are the nearest related to the gross matter of the creation, and which consequently possess the property of acting upon it [e]. In proportion to their purer quality or coarser composition they occupy different places as their residence, either in a denser atmosphere or in higher regions [f].

[a] Jamblichi Chalcidensis ex Cœlesyriâ de mysteriis Liber. Ed. Thom. Gale Oxon. e Theat. Sheld. 1678. Sect. i. c. 7. p. 9. Sect. viii. c. 2. p. 158.

[b] Sect. ii. c. 3. p. 41. οἱ μεν δοκουσιν οὐτοι εἰναι οἱ Κοσμοκρατορες, οἱ τα ὑπο σεληνην στοιχεια διοικουντες.

[c] Sect. i. c. 8. p. 15. ἀλλ' οἱ μεν κρειττονες ἐν αὐτῳ, ὡς ὑπο μηδενος περιεχονται, και περιεχουσι παντα ἐν αὐτοις· τα δ' ἐπι γης ἐν τοις πληρωμασι των Θεων ἐχοντα το εἰναι. κ. τ. λ.

[d] Creuzer in his Symbolik und Mythol. has imputed several of these notions to the Magi, but he has depended on the Zend-Avesta as his authority, the genuineness of which remains to be proved. It probably is worth but little more, than that wretched production the Desatir. In these passages of Jamblichus, we retrace the Amshaspands and the Izeds very distinctly, but whether the original followers of Zerdusht conceived of them in the same manner, as the authors or author of the Zend-Avesta, is very hypothetical.—*Translator.*

[e] Sect. ii. c. 3. p. 41. Sect. v. c. 19. p. 134—35.

[f] Diogen. Laërt. in Procem. p. 5. Henr. Steph. ἀσκειν (Χαλδαιους) τε και μαντικην, και προρρησιν, και αὐτοις Θεους ἐμφανιζεσθαι λεγοντας· ἀλλα και εἰδωλων πληρη εἰναι τον ἀερα, κατ' ἀπορροιαν ὑπο

The highest among these classes of spirits are called ἀρχαι, or ἀρχικον αἰτιον[g]. Others among the Divine natures, θειαι ὐσιαι, are intermediate beings, μεσαι[h].

Those, which occupy themselves with the laws of the world, are also called ἀρχοντες[i], and the ministering spirits are δυναμεις and ἀγγελοι[k].

The ἀρχαγγελοι are not generally recognized in this theory: this class[l] is said to have been of a later

ἀναθυμιασεως εἰσκρινομενων ταις ὑψεσι των ὀξυδερκων. Apul. de Gen. Socr. p. 229—32. Cæterum sunt quædam Divinæ mediæ Potestates inter summum æthera et infimas terras, in isto intersitæ aëris spatio, per quas et desideria et merita nostra ad Deos commeant .... habeant igitur hæc Dæmonum corpora modicum levitatis, ne ad inferna præcipitentur. Although Jamblichus does not agree with the opinion of those, who fix the residence of the spirits according to the increase of corporeality, την προς τα διαφεροντα σωματα κατα ταξιν, οἱον Θεων μεν προς τα αἰθερια, Δαιμονων δε προς τα ἀερια, ψυχων δε των προς την γην, αἰτιαν εἰναι. Sect. i. c. 8. nevertheless, οὶτε ἀεριοι, και οἱ περι γην Δαιμονες, are not the less certain. Sect. vi. c. 6.

[g] Jambl. Sect. i. c. vii. p. 11.

[h] Sect. i. c. 6. The μεσαι are of pure Magian origin: they are the Furuhers. They are connected inseparably with the human soul: they are the prototypes of ideas, they keep watch against Aherman and present the prayers of the just to Ormuzd. United with the human body, they are the germ and impulse of good principles, the conscience which deters man from evil. The Berhani Kattea explains the word as جوهر در مقابل عرض—*Translator.*

[i] Sect. ii. c. 7. p. 49.

[k] Sect. v. c. 21. p. 136.

[l] St. Paul decidedly referred to opinions of this nature;—indeed, he might have deduced them from the Jewish Cabbala, with which, as a Pharisee, he must, necessarily, have been conversant. These ministering angels are noticed under the name of מלאכי־השרת in the Targum, and are called in Sota, 38, 1. and other places מלאכי דשירותא:—the Seraphim likewise bear in the Talmudical works the equivalent appellation שמשין קדישין: consequently, the λειτουργικα πνευματα, in Heb. i. 14. which correspond to these Manichæan and Gnostic dogmata, may have merely been adduced from long association of ideas. The idea of Liturgical Spirits seems, as far as we have been able to extend our researches, to have been general in every part of the world: even the North-American savages appear to

origin, and to have been first introduced by Porphyry among the spiritual world. If we take here also into consideration the ἐξουσιαι, of which Justin has before spoken, we shall have enumerated the greater part of the technical appellations of this Dæmonology [m].

But to arrive at an union with the higher orders of the spiritual world in which alone the highest bliss of man consists, it is necessary before all things, to become disengaged from the servitude of the body, which detains the soul from soaring up to the purely spiritual [n].

Matrimony, therefore, and every inclination to sexual concupiscence must be renounced, before the attainment of this perfection. Hence, the offerings and initiations of the Magi cannot, without great injury, be even communicated to those, who have not as yet emancipated themselves from the libido procreandi, and the propensities to corporeal attachments [o].

To eat meat or to partake in general of any slain animal,—nay, to even touch it, contaminates [p].

have indulged in distinct conceptions of them in their legends of Okkis and Mannitos.

Distinctions of angelic orders are likewise noticed in the Epistle to the Colossians, from whence these theorists may have presumed to apply the speculations of the Alexandrine and Pharisaic Schools on the subject to Christianity.—*Translator.*

[m] From the Egyptian philosophy, the doctrine of the Logos was adopted in this system. Sect. x. c. 6. τοτε τῳ ὁλῳ Δημιουργῳ την ψυχην προσαγει και παρακαταθεται· και ἐκ της πασης ὑλης αὐτην ποιει, μονῳ τῳ ἰδιῳ ΛΟΓΩι συνενωμενην. Οἱον ὁ λεγω τῃ αὐτογονῳ και αὐτοκινητῳ και τῃ ἀνεχουσῃ παντα, και τῃ νοερᾳ και τῃ διακοσμητικῃ των ὁλων (scil. οὐσιᾳ)··συναπτει.····και τουτο τελος ἐστι της παρ' Αἰγυπτιοις ἱερατικης ἀναγωγης.

[n] Sect. v. c. 18. p. 133.

[o] Sect. v. c. 15. p. 133.

[p] διοτι το μη ζωον ζωντι, ὡσπερ τῳ καθαρῳ το ῥυπαρον····μολυσμον τινα ἐντιθησιν. Sect. vi. c. 2. p. 145. cf. c. 1. p. 144.

Bodily exercises and purifications, though not productive of the gifts of prophecy, are nevertheless conducive to them [q].

Though the gods only attend to the pure, they nevertheless sometimes mislead men to impure actions [r]. This may perhaps proceed from the totally different ideas of that, which is good and righteous, which subsist between them and mankind [s].

SECTION CXXVI.

This philosophy, of which the elements had already existed a long time in the East, formed itself, in its progress to the West, into a doctrinal system, which found there far more approbation and celebrity, than it ever had deserved. It was principally (to press closer upon our assertions) welcome in those countries, to which these Epistles of the Apostle are directed. Long afterwards when Paul had converted the Ephesians, a quantity of magical and theurgical books were brought forward by their possessors and burned before his eyes, Acts xix. 19. This city had long since been celebrated for them, and the Εφεσια ἀλεξιφαρμακα, and Εφεσια γραμματα were spells highly extolled by the ancients, for the purpose of procuring an authority over the Dæmons [t].

But even at this very day there exists a public monument, among the ruins of Miletus, an inscription on one of the gates of the town, which authen-

[q] Sect. iii. c. 13. and Sect. iii. c. 11.

[r] Sect. iv. c. 11. p. 114. c. 12. p. 114, 115.

[s] Sect iv. c. 4. p. 108.

[t] Menandri et Philemonis reliquiæ. Edit. Grot. et. J. Clerici, p. 140. Erasm. Adag. Chil. Cent. 8. num. 49. Plutarch. Sympos. Quæst. l. vii. Quæst. V. οἱ Μαγοι τους δαιμονιζομενους κελευουσι τα Ἐφεσια Γραμματα προς αὐτους καταλεγειν και ὀνομαζειν.

ticates the decided belief of Theurgic doctrines in these regions. Let it be allowed to me to cite a part of it here as a proof [u].

ΙΗΕΟΥΩΑ
ΟΥΩ
ΛΕΗΙ [x]
ΑΓΙΕ
ΦΥΛΑΞΟΝ
ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΝ
ΜΙΛΗCΙΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑC
ΤΟΥCΚΑΤΟΙ
ΚΟΥΝΤΑC
ΑΡΧΑΓΓΕΛΩ· ΦΥΛΑCCΕΤΑΙ
ΗΠΟΛΙC ΜΙΛΗCΙΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΕC ΟΙ ΚΑΤ . . .

As late even as in the fourth century the Synod at Laodicea was obliged to institute severe laws against the worship of angels, against magic, and against incantations. These opinions had taken such a deep root in the mind, that some centuries did not suffice for the extinction of the recollection of them.

SECTION CXXVII.

Now, there are assertions of the Apostle, which strikingly characterize this theory.

He calls the doctrinal system of his opponents a *philosophy* incompatible with Christianity, φιλοσοφια οὐ κατα Χριστον, Coloss. ii. 8. *a worship of angels,*

[u] Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levante par Spon. Part i. p. 423. Amst. 1679.

[x] These three initial words seem to be יהוה אלהי.—The OY is probably ה—*Translator.*

[y] θρησκεια των Ἀγγελων, Coloss. ii. 18. *a Dæmonology*, διδασκαλιαι Δαιμονων, 1 Tim. iv. 1.

He calls it still farther γοητεια, 2 Timoth. iii. 13. this is the peculiar expression, by which the ancients denoted magical arts and necromantic experiments; [z] γοης, is, according to Hesychius, μαγος, κολαξ, περιεργος, and γοητευει, ἀπατᾷ, μαγευει, φαρμακευει, ἐξαιδει. λ.

Paul compares these teachers to Jannes and Jambres, 2 Timothy iii. 8. These, as we have before seen, are according to the ancient tradition, the magicians[a], who withstood Moses by their arts. They

[y] It is to be remembered in the interpretation of this and other like passages, that Hug belongs to the Roman Catholic Church.—*Translator.*

[z] St. Paul has not once used the word γοητεια, and probably in the passage, which is cited (πονηροι δε ἀνθρωποι και γοητες) he simply alluded to false teachers, for the sequel authorizes us in selecting for our interpretation of γοης,—ἀπατεων or πλανος, as Suidas and Timæus (Lex. Plat.) have explained the word, who are corroborated by Pollux, (Onom. l. ix. c. 8. l. iv. c. vi.) and Hesychius. If we compare this passage with 2 Maccab. xii. 4., it will be evident, that the allusion was to men of "enticing words." So also Josephus Antiq. l. xi. c. 6. uses the same phrase. Yet several of the fathers used γοητεια, in the sense which Hug ascribes to it, and such was probably its most common acceptation: but in the Epistle to Timothy, it incontrovertibly bears no such a signification. The Goëtic philosophy was Oriental, and is the गौत्र of the Sanscrit writers.—*Translator.*

[a] Targum Jonathan, Exod. i. 15. vii. 11. Plin. Hist. Nat. L. xxx. c. 2. p. 48. vol. 5. Bipont. Apuleii Orat. de Magiâ, T. i. Bipont. p. 94. Ego sum ille Moses, vel Jannes, etc. It may be easily seen from this, that the emendation in the last edition of Pliny, à Mose *etiamnum* et Jotape has not succeeded. Cf. Gr. Abu'lpharagii, Dynast. i. p. 26. The daughter of Pharaoh delivered Moses الي يانيس ويمبريس الحكميين to be instructed by them.

With respect to Jannes and Jambres a multiplicity of traditions has

were from time immemorial names so notorious in the magical science, that they did not remain unknown even to the Neo-Platonics.

When the Apostle enjoins the Ephesians to array themselves in the arms of faith and courageously to endure the combat, vi. 12. he says, that it is the more necessary, because their combat is not against human force οὐ προς αἱμα και σαρκα, but against superhuman Natures. Where he mentions these, he enumerates in order the names of this Magico-Spiritual world, ἀρχας, ἐξουσιας, particularly the κοσμοκρατορας; and likewise fixes their abode in the upper aërial regions, εἰς τον ἀερα, ἐν τοις ἐπουρανιοις.

In like manner, in the Epistle to the Colossians for the sake of representing to them Christianity in an exalted and important light, and of praising the Divine nature of Jesus, he says, that all that exists is his creation, and is subjected to him, not even the spiritual world excepted. He then selects the magical appellations to demonstrate, that this supposititious Dæmonocracy is merely subservient to him:

survived. Their names are variously written in the Rabbinical works, *e. g.* יואני ואמברוסיאו–ינוס וימברינוס–יאנוס ויאמברוס– יחני וממרא ויונוס ויומברוס– &c. &c. These fabulators pretend them to have been the sons of Balaam, and to have predicted the birth of Moses to Pharaoh. As Moses grew up, they fled into Æthiopia, &c. &c. They were however converted by the miracles of Moses to the worship of Jehovah. "Yet *they continued to fly in the air and perform enchantments*," until Michäel, by the command of the Almighty precipitated them into the Red Sea. Other legends may be seen in Menacoth, 85. 1. Jonathan pretends them to have been with Balaam, when the angel struck the ass. Numenius the philosopher has also recorded several traditions respecting them, which are preserved in Eusebius's Præp. Ev. he refers them to the order of ἱερογραμματεῖς. But of the different modes of writing their names, the book Zohar, as the most ancient, which writes them יונס ויומבריס is perhaps the most deserving of attention.—*Translator.*

whether they be Θρονοι or κυριοτητες, ἀρχαι, ἐξουσιαι, Coloss. i. 16. He also makes use of πληρωμα the expression peculiar to the Theurgic system, for the purpose of thereby pointing out the original cause of all corporeal and spiritual existence, whence all intermediate causes, even to the last which is imaginable, have emanated, and maintains, that each has a retrospective reference to Jesus, and that the πληρωμα is resident in him; ὁτι ἐν αὐτῳ εὐδοκησε παν το πληρωμα κατοικησαι, i. 19. ii. 9. Ephes. i. 23.

Finally, to destroy completely and decisively the whole doctrinal system, he demonstrates, that Christ, through the work of redemption, has obtained the victory over the entire spiritual creation, that he drags in triumph the ἀρχας and ἐξουσιας as vanquished, and that henceforth their dominion and exercise of power have ceased, Coloss. ii. 15.

But what he says respecting the seared consciences of these heretics, respecting their deceptions, their avarice, etc. is certainly more applicable to this class of men, than to any other. None throughout all antiquity are more accused of these immoralities, than those pretended confidants of the Occult Powers.

If he speaks warmly against the distinction of meats, against abstinence from matrimony, this also applies to them, and if he rejects bodily exercises, it was because they recommended them, because they imposed baths, lustrations, continence, and long preparations, as the conditions, by which alone the connection with the Spirits became possible.

These then are the persons, who passed before the Apostle's mind, and who, when they adopted Christianity, established that sect among the professors of Jesus, which gave to it the name of Gnostics, and which, together with the different varieties of this

system, is accused by history of magical arts. Other adherents of this system among the heathens, to which the Syrian philosophers, as well as some Egyptian, such as Plotinus and his scholars belonged, formed the sect of Neo Platonism.

SECTION CXXVIII.

OBSERVATIONS RESPECTING THE MOST RECENT ATTACKS ON THE TWO EPISTLES TO TIMOTHY, AND ON THAT TO TITUS.

We have before (Sect. 107) taken into consideration the accusations, which have been brought against the first Epistle to Timothy. Soon after an accuser arose, not only against the first, but likewise against the second to Timothy and that to Titus, or against the three pastoral writings, as he calls them, and summoned them before the tribunal of criticism; partly from arguments derived from the language and the tone which is peculiar to them, and partly from historical difficulties, which are opposed to them [b].

It struck him that certain expressions occur only in these Epistles, and are not read any where else in Paul. Inasmuch as they are only confined to ἁπαξ λεγομενα, as 1 Tim. i. 5. τελος της παραγγελιας, and ii. 10. ἐπαγγελομεναι θεοσεβειαν, etc. we cannot be expected to bestow our attention upon them; for there is not one of Paul's Epistles, which might not (as

[b] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. iii. Part 1. § 246.

may be imagined) contain several such [c]. But on the other hand, the peculiar phraseology with regard to the heretics and their assertions, which is common to the three Epistles, deserves a much greater attention. Their doctrines are called μυθοι and γραωδεις μυθοι; 1 Tim. i. 4.; iv. 7.; 2 Tim. iv. 4.; Titus i. 4.; to which let us still add the far stronger term βεβηλους κενοφωνιας. 1 Tim. vi. 20.; 2 Tim. ii. 16.; True doctrine is on the contrary, διδασκαλια ὑγιαινουσα, 1 Tim. i. 10.; 2 Tim. iv. 3.; Tit. i. 9.; ii. 1.; also λογος ὑγιης and λογοι ὑγιαινοντες, Tit. ii. 7.; 1 Tim. vi. 3.; 2 Tim. i. 13. Religion is εὐσεβεια, 1 Tim. vi. 3.; 2 Tim. iii. 5.; Tit. i. 1. etc. In two of these Epistles a complaint is brought against γενεαλογιας, Tit. iii. 9. and γενεαλογιας ἀπεραντους, 1 Tim. i. 4.

Paul has not directly spoken of the Heretics in any of his writings, but, as in the Epistle to the Ephesians and Colossians, has only glanced at their opinions, and placed them in the shade, when compared with the fundamental doctrines of Christian instruction. Whether then it happened from the principle of forbearance, with which he wished publicly to treat them, 2 Tim. ii. 25. or because he did not wish to interrupt the solemn tone of this Epistle by digressions, or from both causes collectively, Paul has sufficiently described the pernicious race of heretics, only in the Epistles to his friends and assistants in the ministry, principally in those to Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. 1—9.; vi. 3—6.; 2 Tim. ii. 16—19. 23.; iii. 1—10.; iv. 3—5.; some of them

[c] Heinrich Planck (Observations on the first Epistle of Paul to Timothy, p. 51, 52.) has, in the Epistle to the Philippians, counted 54 ἁπαξ λεγομενα; in that to the Galatians 57; in those to the Ephesians and Colossians 145. In the first to Timothy 81; in the second 63: in that to Titus 44.

he even mentioned by name; and in the Epistle to Titus he called his attention to phænomena of this sort, i. 10—12. 14—16.; iii. 9—12. For this purpose, he has used words, which he could not use elsewhere, where these things are not stated, or are stated at least in a different manner; words, which spoken in confidence describe the subject as it is; μυθους, γραωδεις μυθους, βεβηλους κενοφωνιας; and antitheses, which are apposite, as they regard the state of those who are led astray, which Paul conceived to be a spiritual malady. (νοσων περι ζητησις· 1 Tim. vi. 4. and ὡς γαγραινα, 2 Tim. ii. 17.) The opposite of this is certainly *sound doctrine, wholesome instruction*, λογος ὑγιης, διδασκαλια ὑγιαινουσα.

Under these spiritual errors he reckons γενεαλογιας or γενεαλογιας ἀπεραντους, which is not well explained by the Jewish propensity to preserve their genealogical pedigrees. They are rather a constituent part of the φιλοσοφια οὐ κατα Χριστον, Coloss. ii. 8. θρησκεια των ἀγγελων, Coloss. ii. 18., the διδασκαλιαι δαιμονιων; 1 Tim. iv. 1., or of the philosophical system of the time, which taught for certain purposes a successive gradation of spirits, and their descent from each other.

In this philosophical system the [d] whole worship of

[d] The whole of this excursus on Paul's allusions, however ingenious, must not be regarded as certain. Hug seems to have mistaken γενεαλογια for γενεσις, in his synopsis of heretical opinions. Suidas says, that γενεσις λεγεται και ἡ εἱμαρμενη: that it is human destiny irrevocably determined at the birth of the individual. To this the early fathers were most strenuously opposed, not to the γενεαλογια, about which we no where observe any strictures. Chrysostom says on this Epistle to Timothy, οὑτω παντα τα ὀλεθρια δογματα της ψυχης ἐκβαλλομεν της ἡμετερας, οἱον, Γενεσιν λεγω και ΕΙΜΑΡΜΕΝΗΝ.... πιστευσον ὁτι ἐστι Θεος δικαιος, και οὐ πιστευσεις, ὁτι ἐστι Γενεσις ἀδικος· πιστευσον ὁτι ἐστι Θεος προνοων, και οὐ πιστευσεις, ὁτι ἐστι Γενεσις παντα συνεχουσα. κ. τ. λ. Numberless analogous

God, which comprised all the branches of the θρησκεια, was called εὐσεβεια *. On which account Paul, in the Epistles of which we are speaking, zealously argues against the εὐσεβεια of these men, 2 Tim. iii. 5.; 1 Tim. vi. 5.; 2 Tim. iii. 12, 13.,

passages might be adduced. If by γενεαλογια he intended to imply either the Jewish Sephiroth or the Gnostic Æones (as Grotius conjectures) or the descent of the Δαιμονες from each other, still γενεσις would have been the proper word. St. Paul simply alluded to the absurdities attached to the Jewish genealogical tables.

He also appears to have strained the point with respect to Θρησκεια and εὐσεβεια, which the ancient Glossarists determine to be nearly correlative terms; θρησκεια having probably a more immediate reference to systems of religious worship, and εὐσεβεια to internal purity of heart and piety properly so called. The former, by the Fathers, is applied both to the true religion and to false systems. Justin Martyr makes use of it, when he is speaking of the worship of the Pagan Deities: and both Gregory Nazianzen and Suidas conjecture its derivation from Θραξ, because Orpheus the Thracian first introduced this system among the Greeks. Θρησκεια, like many other words in Greek, was doubtless of Barbarian origin:—it seems to be analogous to दृश *knowledge* or *wisdom*. From the same root proceeds दर्शन, the name of one of the Sastras or Hindû Philosophical Systems, a person skilled in which is called दर्शकै, which appears to have been the source of the Greek word. Εὐσεβεια has but one meaning, which is that given to it by Suidas, ἐπιστημη Θεου θεραπειας.—*Translator.*

* Jamblich. de Myster. Sect. v. c. 21. p. 136—οὐκ ἐκ μερους χρη, οὐδε ἀτελως συνυφαινειν τοις Θειοις την ἐπιβαλλουσαν εὐσεβειαν. —Sect. v. c. 18. p. 133. ἐν δε τοις ἀλλοις τοις εὐσεβειας μυριοις, και ὃη ἐν τῳ θυηπολικῳ μερει. λ. It is farther to be observed, that εὐσεβης was in the religious language of the age equivalent to σεβομενος, Acts x. 2. 7. whence εὐσεβεια included a secondary idea of transition from Heathenism to Judaism, and to the Jewish ritual: thus it occurs in Joseph. Antiq. xx. cap. 2. n. δ. καρπος εὐσεβειας, and Ant. lib. cit. c. 2. n. 4. τον Θεον εὐσεβειν is to embrace the Jewish religion, and c. 4. v. 1. ἡ προς Θεον εὐσεβεια, is the reception of Judaism. To recommend this was not Paul's concern; wherefore, he had good reason to avoid this expression in Epistles to whole communities, in which misconception or misinterpretation of many things was to be apprehended.

and opposes to their opinions the high doctrine of genuine εὐσεβεια (1 Tim. iii. 16. and vi. 3.) preserving the word, but purifying and rectifying the idea.

Let us then cease to be surprised, if we do not find these expressions also in other writings of the Apostle, in which he is speaking of quite different things; or where noticing the same heresies and Heretics, he speaks of them in a different manner. Only in the Epistles to his friends, and principally in those to Timothy, has he entered into a circumstantial description of these men and their errors, for the purpose of admonishing his younger assistants in the faith to be cautious and watchful.

From a similar principle it may be explained, why the Apostle calls himself, only in the Epistles to Timothy, κηρυξ και ἀποστολος, διδασκαλος ἐθνων, 1 Tim. ii. 7.; 2 Tim. i. 11.; and no where else. He has declared himself (as it respects his appointment) to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, only in two Epistles to whole communities, viz. to the Romans and Galatians. For, as a teacher, he was obliged to observe an equal conduct towards all believers, and not to betray any predilection to either of the two branches of the Christian School, nor to concede to one a privilege as to his person, as long as he was able to avoid it. In the Epistle to the Romans, in which he defends the cause of the Gentiles against Jewish darkness and conceit, he confesses himself, xi. 13. *partly* to be a teacher of the Gentiles, ἐφ' ὁσον εἰμι ἐγω ἐθνων ἀποστολος, without withdrawing himself from the Jews, or unduly ceding any thing to them; and in the fifteenth chapter he veils his efforts in favour of the Gentiles in a religious metaphor, and justifies these words by the example of Christ [f], by

[f] This allusion is probably contained in *ver.* 8—13.—*Translator.*

virtue of which he successfully brings the Gentile world under obedience to the Lord. In the Epistle to the Galatians, where he labours in the pure doctrine against the aspersions of Judaism, he maintains his importance as teacher, against those, who rank him inferior to the Apostles at Jerusalem in illumination, by the fact that these Apostles have themselves acknowledged his most high vocation and full authority for the conversion of Gentiles, and have accounted him, (Paul) equal to themselves, ii. 6—10. He allows the facts to speak without drawing from thence a deduction in favour of his Apostolic office among the Gentiles, as the question which he had to answer did not oblige him to this explanation. Thus far has he expressed himself respecting his relation to the Gentiles in Epistles to whole communities, not precipitately, as it is evident, but with restraint and precaution, that he might not mortify the believers converted from Judaism, by declaring the Gentiles to have been the chief object of his mission, and themselves as a supplementary and secondary consideration. He had no reason to be thus cautious in the Epistles to Timothy, and could express himself without reserve and circumlocution respecting the principal object of his vocation and the direction of his endeavours to a man, from whom he had no secret on the subject: I AM A HERALD TO THE GENTILES, THEIR APOSTLE AND TEACHER.

Another scruple is made at the asseveration, πιστος ὁ λογος, which recurs three times in the first Epistle to Timothy, also in the second, and in that to Titus, 1 Tim. i. 15.; iii. 1.; iv. 9.; 2 Tim. ii. 11.; Tit. iii. 8.; and is no where else read in Paul. Let us see how he acts in other respects. Instead of πιστος ὁ λογος he elsewhere makes use of the affirmation πιστος ὁ Θεος, 2 Cor. i. 18. μαρτυς μου ἐστιν ὁ Θεος, Rom. i. 9.; Philip. i. 8. ὑμεις μαρτυρες και ὁ Θεος, 1 Thess. ii. 10.

Also αληθειαν λεγω εν Χριστῳ· οὐ ψευδομαι, Rom. ix. 1. just as it is repeated in 1 Tim. ii. 7. Still more solemnly ἐγω δε μαρτυρα τον Θεον ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπι την ἐμην ψυχην. 2 Cor. i. 23. even supplicatingly and with a Doxology, ὁ Θεος και πατηρ του Κυριου ἡμων I. X. οἰδεν, ὁ ὢν εὐλογητος εἰς τους αἰωνας, ὁτι οὐ ψευδομαι, 2 Cor. xi. 31. These forms are certainly very different from the others; but here again two different considerations naturally present themselves; we see, that the latter are affirmations to a number of people of dissimilar opinions, to whole congregations and communities, before whom he refers, for a confirmation, to God and Jesus. The others, on the contrary, are affirmations, uttered not with solemnity, but merely to friends, the whole emphasis of which consists in the words πιστος ὁ λογος, which were sufficient for friends, who were acquainted with the sentiments of the Apostle, and the force of these words.

As to what besides relates to the expression in the aggregate, the illustrious opponent of these Epistles confesses, that *They possess in their language much of Paul's style*, which he shows by several examples; he likewise does not disown the similarity in the principles and modes of proof[g].

But, he continues, has their language the same vigour as in the confessedly authentic Epistles of Paul? Has it not more lightness and plainness, etc.? This is a singular objection: for, is not this always the case? are not lightness and plainness the quality of friendly epistles? whereas compositions, destined for a more extensive circulation, and treatises relating to business, about the

[g] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. Part I. § 247. f. 317—319.

impression and result of which we labor under uncertainty and apprehension, bear the stamp of the state of the mind, in which they were composed. Consequently, it is not in general judged fair to take writings of the latter sort as a specimen, to estimate friendly epistles by their standard, and to reject the latter, where they do not coincide in parallels with the former: as if the mantle of the priest and the domestic dress of the priest could not be different.

But, when the opponent of the three Epistles further asserts, that the other writings of Paul are by far less polished, more careless, and more like to hastily composed prose, than to that on which accurate labor has been expended, it is absolutely incorrect, as stated in such general terms.

Probably the problem,—whence arose it that Marcion had not the three Epistles in his Ἀποστολικον? is regarded as an external proof. If we consider their contents, we shall be satisfied on that point: in them alone we find an unqualified disapprobation of the accommodation of the heretical systems in Asia to Christianity, and a moral portrait of their founders, not flattered in any one lineament. Sketches of this description afforded opportunity for comparisons, matter for parallels which were rather to be avoided: on which account, it appeared not advisable for him to preserve documents of this nature, or even indeed to acknowledge their authority, by their admission into the Ἀποστολικον.

SECTION CXXIX.

The objections of this scholar, hitherto enumerated, are general, and refer equally to all three

Epistles. But now he proceeds to the difficulties which are opposed on the part of history, to each of them individually, for the sake of showing from thence, that they *cannot possibly* have been written by Paul. As I have assigned the first place in order of time, to the Epistle to Titus, it therefore retains it also in the order of the discussion.

The different opinions respecting the Apostle's journey to Crete, which caused the Epistle to Titus, may have whatever value they please; I am merely responsible for my own. But I can with difficulty recognise it in the distortions which it has undergone [h]. I am in a perplexity, believing that I have explained myself clearly, and being loth to repeat what I have said. Paul had resolved to visit Palestine after the first European voyage. He embarked at Corinth and landed at Ephesus, Acts xviii. 16. 19. During this voyage I presume that there was an opportunity of going to Crete in two ways, either by embarking on board a vessel, which, on account of freight and business, went by Crete to Ephesus; or by being driven to Crete in a storm. The first I conceive not improbable, as Apollos, who sailed from Ephesus to Corinth, Acts xviii. 24.—xix. 1., likewise went by Crete, and was there recommended to Titus, Tit. iii. 13. whence it appears not to have been an unusual road of commerce between Corinth and Ephesus. Yet I did not at the same time reject the second possibility, because Paul mentions three dangers at sea in the second Epistle to the Corinthians, which are not disclosed in the Acts of the Apostles, which, nevertheless, might in some way be connected with the events. These were the

[h] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. Part I. § 250. p. 376.

two contingencies, which occasioned me to conceive the circuitous way from Corinth to Ephesus by Crete. The first remained untouched; the second was attacked, because Luke here knew nothing of a storm at sea. But the whole of this part of the history is not related, but merely announced; ἐξεπλει εἰς την Συριαν—κατηντησε δε εἰς Ἐφεσον. What was the cause of Paul, who had embarked for Syria, coming instead to Ephesus? This is a trifling difference, which does not amount to more than thirty days' journey by land[1], and at least to ten by sea. Let me be informed how it happened, that the Apostle went so far out of his way:—then this storm will be conjured up.

The other arguments, by which I have supported my opinion, do not need any supplementary elucidation. The objections respecting Nicopolis concern others; I have named my Nicopolis, which is indisputably connected with the subject of my assertion.

SECTION CXXX.

The order conducts us to the first Epistle to Timothy. We have before shown in what manner it is arranged in the connection of the history. If the modern adversary of the Epistle had thought proper to pay due attention to this, his objections would have been considerably reduced. For this purpose he has principally occupied himself with

[1] From Ephesus to Antioch, the capital of Upper Syria, the stated distance is literally authenticated. Philostorg. H. E. L. i. c. 3. διεστωσης δε και της Ἐφεσιων ἐκ της Ἀντιοχου ὁδον ἡμερων μαλιστα τριακοντα.

the hypothesis of the Honourable Chancellor Mosheim [k], which affords an opportunity of accumulating objections to one so inclined.

Independently of these difficulties, which the learned antagonist opposes from history, not so much to the Epistle as to the opinions of Mosheim and Benson, whose merits I honor, yet without coinciding in their notions, I feel myself in other respects called upon to contradict him, namely, with regard to the view of the Ephesian community, which is contained in the Epistle, and to the respect, in which the person of Timothy appears to have been regarded in it.

Is it indeed credible, it is asked, that the community at Ephesus should have remained so long without a teacher, and so entirely without any knowledge of an ecclesiastical institution, as it is stated in the first Epistle to Timothy?

At first the Apostle was obliged to teach, and some time must have elapsed before he could seek those men among the multitude of the believers, who, being respectable in their lives, might also be the most enlightened in the ministry. The selection of teachers was therefore at all events one of the last occupations, 1 Tim. v. 22. Another argument is here to be considered; where the Apostle founded a community, he divided the dignity of the ministry with nobody; he ranked there as an apostle from God. As assistants in other affairs he had Titus and Timothy. Not until the Apostolical work was completed, and Paul had left his station, was it time to deliver the community to the charge of others; for which reason he postponed this business till

[k] Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. Part I. § 248. p. 333—338.

Pentecost, the solemn day of the gifts of the Spirit, which he had fixed, as the limit of his residence at Ephesus. An insurrection, however, tore him away sooner from the circle of his disciples, and thus nothing remained but to place Timothy over them, and to admonish them to respect his deputy.

Moreover the Epistle by no means contains the idea, that the Ephesians were ignorant of the Ecclesiastical institution, with which they soon became acquainted at Colossæ, Laodicea, and elsewhere. Paul even thought it superfluous to teach them, in what manner the elections were to be made; to determine, what the Episcopus and the Presbyter, etc. had to perform, where the extent of the one's office terminated, and the other's sphere of operation commenced.

They might also easily have conceived, that a quarrelsome person and drunkard could not be the representative of a community, which, in purity of morals, was to be the pattern for the rest of the world. But this is not the question; such they once were, but now in the Christian society they had become improved, and could in consequence of their change of mind put themselves on a par with the good, and perhaps excel them in discernment. How then? if they offered themselves for Ecclesiastical offices, were their claims unfounded? Upon this point, is was necessary to decide. In the bosom of the community their appointment might have less scruple; but as far as it related to the respect which the Church had to support externally, they could obtain no countenance. With their Pagan fellow-citizens, they were more famous for their ill-behaviour than for their improvement, which took place unobserved. If they now became by chance known as Heads of the Christian school, the

reputation of the whole community was endangered. Like these, so are the greater part of institutions with regard to the Ecclesiastical offices, not instructions relating to the discharge of them, but restrictions and preventions, as far as the pretensions of intruders are concerned.

This is the case with the νεοφυτοι, who might venture[1] to present themselves as candidates for the Ecclesiastical offices, whilst there were in the community older Christians and more approved in faith and doctrine. This is the case with the women, who laid claims to the respect of widows and to the benefactions belonging to them, v. 9—17.

Now as to what relates to the person of Timothy. He is, (it is said), according to this Epistle, still a novice in all things; what a contradiction! Shortly before Paul describes him to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. iv. 17., as a man, who comprehended the whole doctrinal system, as Paul is accustomed to deliver it every where; whereas in the first Epistle to Timothy, Paul is obliged to draw his attention to the first principles of the doctrine, that he might know how to conduct himself, 1 Tim. iii. 16. Let him understand this who is able, exclaims this scholar[m]!

Yet is it not so difficult of comprehension. Perfectly to comprehend a doctrinal system in its full extent, to be able to answer questions respecting it,

[1] This is confirmed by Gregory Nazianzen (Or. fun. Athan.) ὁμου τε μαθηται και διδασκαλοι της εὐσεβειας, χθες ἱεροσυλοι, και σημερον ἱερεις· χθες των ἁγιων ἐξω, και μυσταγωγοι σημερον. Against this practice, Justinian (Novell. cxxiii. c. 1.) enacted a law, with which Canon ii. of the Council of Nice, Canon lxxx. of those, which pass under the names of the Apostles, and Canon x. of the Council of Sardis may be compared.—*Translator.*

[m] Eichhorn's Introd. to the New Testament, Vol. iii. Pt. I. § 248. p. 340.

and to resolve doubts: and to know, how to extract from the whole those doctrines, which are adapted to a place and its peculiar necessities, which should be enforced there more cogently than in any other place, are two very different things. The discussion here rests on the latter, on that, which the local circumstances at Ephesus require, respecting which Paul, far from analyzing his system to a learner, merely gives a hint to the already instructed individual, which, being comprized in few words, remains to us, who are not so well instructed, a difficult passage in the New Testament.

If for a moment we compare Paul's recommendation to him, as to the moral instruction, in the words ταυτα παραγγελλε, 1 Tim. iv. 10.; v. 7.; vi. 17. Paul's idea, that the spirit of the doctrines, not the outward exercise of them, sanctifies — that the moral principles of a libidinous widow rest on an insecure foundation, or that an absurd pride of wealth is unbecoming in the Christian school, cannot be supposed to be unknown to Timothy.

The Apostle, in a manner which no one can mistake, merely selects particular local failings, which his representative is enjoined to oppose by admonitions: considered from this point of view, these and the like animadversions, which have been objected to the Epistle, receive their refutation.

In continuation, the Timothy well versed in the discharge of his office, as we see him in 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2.; and 1 Cor. iv. 17.; is contrasted with the Timothy as he appears in the first Epistle of Paul, which is directed to him as a novice unacquainted with the employment which is assigned to him. Let us not be led astray by the cases adduced. When Paul sent him to the Thessalonians with the commission of inspiring them with courage and perse-

verance in the faith, which they had received, 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2., and when he then sent him to Corinth in the quality of an envoy with the important commission, of explaining and removing doubts (where they remained relative to the object of the first Epistle to this community) according to his insight into the Apostle's doctrinal system, 1 Cor. iv. 17.—these offices exhibit Timothy, as a trust-worthy agent; but neither of the two commissions is in any way to be compared with the present. Never hitherto had he presided as the head of a numerous congregation, empowered to direct their social constitution, the appointment of the ministry, and other offices of the Church. We therefore find here another affair, but not another Timothy. It is one thing to be skilful and learned, and it is another to possess experience and knowledge of mankind adequate to the successful management of an office, where these qualities are in a high degree required. To provide these, is the principal object of his experienced teacher.

Timothy was indeed a colleague as to dignity, or what is still more, a friend and congenial spirit, ἰσοψυχος, of the Apostle: yet, this did not make him older or more experienced in the world. Six years had elapsed from the time, that Paul had received him into his society, Acts xvi. 1., up to the occurrence at Ephesus. When Paul associated him with him, he was not yet an ἀδελφος[n]; he was only a μαθητης, a disciple

[n] The μαθηται corresponded to the תלמידין of the Jewish Doctors. Like those of the Eastern and Greek philosophers, they were commonly called תלמידי חכמים, concerning whose required virtues and duties the Rabbinical pages are diffuse. Chrysostom seems in his definition of μαθηται, and in his account of their duties to have had these Jewish opinions vivid in his remembrance. (Hom. in binas

in the Christian school; if we suppose him at that time to have been twenty years of age, yet he would still be a youth, whose circumspection Paul was obliged to waken and sharpen, lest he should be ensnared by hasty opinions δια προκριματος; or (as he further says) be deceived by partiality προσκλισεως, 1 Tim. v. 21. We therefore see, that the subject relates not to knowledge, but to acquaintance with the world and mankind.

When Paul sent him to Thessalonica, when he sent him to Corinth, he did not, compelled by circumstances, as at Ephesus, leave him without preparations and instructions respecting the object of his mission. No tradition has preserved to us what instruction, what exhortations, how much or little he then gave to him, by which we may be able to estimate the scope of the Epistle, which required him to provide them with oral information. In default of this, general truth directs us in our judgment of this Epistle; what the precept, which the Apostle sent to him at Ephesus, might contain,

Ep. ad Tim.) The New Testament mentions those of the Pharisees, those of John and those of Christ.

The ἀδελφοι according to Theodoret (in Ps. xxi.) are οἱ εἰς αὐτον πεπιστευκοτες—the members of Christ's religion, οἱ (Asterius apud Phot. Bib.) τον αὐτον ἐχοντες Ποιητην,....εὐσεβειας δε και πολιτειας ἑνα θεσμον και την ἐλπιδα του μελλοντος την αὐτην. The Greeks called things, which were similar, ἀδελφα (*Etym. Magn.*) and Vorstius has amply proved such to be the force of the corresponding Hebrew word. For instance, Kimchi criticizing a passage of Isaiah, says, אין לו אח במקרא "that word has *no brother* in the Scriptures." The Arabs continually use أخ in this signification. If then, it can be proved, that μαθηται and ἀδελφοι were not synonyms, the first will seem to be the converts not perfectly instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, the others those who in point of instruction were on a par with the teachers.—*Translator.*

how far it might enter into detail and minutiæ, is not merely to be adjudged from the qualities of the man who received it, but likewise from the carefulness of him who communicated it. Even if we had now found the criterion of the first, that of the second changes the whole again. Admitting even that Paul in this instance had done too much with regard to Timothy, the old observation is only confirmed; *habet hoc sollicitudo, quod omnia necessaria putat*[*].

In this, viz. in the anxieties devoted to such multifarious minutiæ, the censure is completely refuted; that the Epistle is deficient in all those details, on which the Apostle is so fond of dwelling. There are so many considerations respecting the weaknesses of certain classes and members of the society—so many anxieties and precautions, that our critic stumbled against them, and founded on them his conclusion, that "Timothy is mentioned and represented in this writing, as too inexperienced and unadvised, and the community more ignorant, than it probably was." Might he not with as much reason have thence concluded, that the author was acquainted with this community, in the most intimate degree? that he had clearly seen in spirit the actions and impulses of every one, and more particularly the incentives of some with respect to the Ecclesiastical arrangements, and that as a careful father separated from his family, he was anxious in his Epistle to devote his thoughts to the whole household and every thing belonging to it, and to take measures against any impropriety, which might be apprehended.

If he desires particulars from the life of Timothy, to such we can refer him, 1 Tim. i. 18.; iv. 14.; v. 23.;

[*] Plin. Epist. L. vi. ep. 9.

vii. 12. But the doubt, on account of the Apostle not having by a single word, contrary to the custom among friends, mentioned the progress of his journey and his own health, might as well have been omitted. Such matters the Apostle was accustomed to entrust to the bearers of the Epistles, for which he selected men, on whom reliance might be placed, Coloss. iv. 7.; Ephes. vi. 21, 22.

The manifold respect to circumstances in the Epistle, and its considerate attention to minutiæ, which by a distortion have been attempted to be applied to its disadvantage, are rather qualities, which vouch for its authenticity. So, must it have been framed with regard to a community in which Paul had lived a long time, in which he had known every one, had taught in public and in private, exhorted, and some of whom he had improved, with tears, μετα δακρυων, Acts xx. 20. 31, and who, through his endeavours and cares, had become still dearer to him. If we compare it with the Epistle to Titus, the latter is indeed by no means deficient in fine passages, spoken with elevation of mind; but it is, nevertheless, an official direction, which treats more of generals, and is composed under feelings of contempt for the neglected nation, in which Titus was to commence his office: it seems to have originated merely in reverence to the ministry and charge, amidst hopes which were half extinct. On the contrary, the Epistle to Timothy is composed with a careful attention to the particular community, with solicitude, and a host of minuter anxieties, with sympathy and affection.

Sometimes also the condition of the Apostle manifestly gleams through it. Expelled from Ephesus, and on the other hand uncertain, whether the commotions at Corinth would allow him to appear in the midst of this community without insult, he some-

times cast his glance back upon Ephesus, hoping that the disturbances might probably have so far ceased as to enable him to shew himself there again, by the favour and intervention of the chiefs of this city, Acts xix. 31. At one time he seems to count more upon this possibility, at another to have more confidence in the Corinthians. Both hopes occur in 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15; and in iv. 13. he once more returns to the first, like a man, who pressed between two misfortunes, does not yet know, which is the greatest.

SECTION CXXXI.

We shall now devote our attention to the second Epistle to Timothy. Here also I must repeat the remark, that all the objections against it could not have taken place, if my opinion respecting it (which I believe not to be superficial) had been weighed. I here principally allude to the objection respecting Trophimus and Erastus[p], 2 Tim. iv. 26.

The next difficulty is caused by Aquilas, whom the author of this Epistle salutes, as if he were at Ephesus; 2 Tim. iv. 19. although Paul not long before knew him to be at Rome, whither he sends him his salutation, Rom. xvi. 3. But the intermediate time between the two Epistles or salutations amounts to three years and upwards; for a person to change his place of residence within three years, cannot be reckoned among the impossibilities, which would invalidate the Epistle. It were even possible for him to have possessed at Ephesus a spacious house of his own, 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

[p] Eichhorn's Introd. to N. T. vol. iii. pt. 1. § 249. pa. 358.

I must state another objection in this scholar's own words. Would indeed the Apostle (he says), if he wished to invigorate and strengthen the courage of his associate, have merely mentioned the persecutions (2 Tim. iii. 11. cf. Acts xiii. 14—52. xiv. 1—6.) of which Timothy was not an eye witness, since they occurred in the time which preceded his acquaintance with him? Would he have passed over in utter silence those far severer ones at Philippi, at Thessalonica, at Jerusalem, which before the eyes of Timothy were impending over his teacher? &c.

If we examine the passage in 2 Tim. iii. 11., we shall see that Paul begins an enumeration; "at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra;" but instead of continuing it, passes into generals, οἵους διώγμους. λ. The reason of his commencement with Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, is obvious, because he commences from the outset, from his first journey among the heathens. Why he does not further continue the enumeration is natural, because Timothy, as an eye-witness, can himself continue it. Conscious of this, Paul passes into generals, and breaks off a longer catalogue, which was superfluous to Timothy.

What moreover this scholar writes against all those, who place the composition of the Epistle during a second Roman imprisonment, does not concern me, nor, as it appears to me, the Epistle.

But whoever can account it a fictitious composition, must mistake the expression of the deeply affected mind of a man, who had just escaped the most dangerous storm of his life, and had endured this harsh event without assistance. All except Luke had saved themselves previously, and resigned the Apostle to himself, and without aid to his danger. Even Titus did not display the courage of hazarding any thing for his teacher and friend. Now, indeed,

a momentary calm had occurred; but a second storm was also certain, of which it was to be feared, that it would not rage more mildly. These sorrows and complaints against his friends the Apostle keeps back with dignity and firmness, throughout the whole Epistle, until the end, where he gives vent to them with pathos and moderation, in a few sentences; iv. 6.

But from the beginning, a darkly enveloped sense of danger and of wounded confidence prevails throughout the whole composition; the latter of which less from intention than from a predominating tone, applies also to him, for whom it was not peculiarly intended. Soon after the introduction and in the sequel, the Apostle seeks every reason collectively to assure himself of the fidelity and constancy of his younger friend:—the example of his mother and grandmother; his consecration to the higher Branch of the ministry; the former proofs of his sentiments; the promises of Jesus Christ; and the rewards in a future state. Among these he again scatters instructions and exhortations, as if, uncertain whether he should see him again, he was desirous of imparting to him the last consolations before his death, as unto a son, on whom his hopes rest, and whom he secretly considered as the guardian of his Apostolic Bequest.

The Epistle is evidently written under all those sensations, which must have necessarily predominated in the Apostle's condition, and after the experience which he had just acquired; all the parts, which refer to his situation, are striking, and many passages (which none can well deny) are fraught with understanding and genius.

But now,—what a difference prevails between this and the Epistle to the Ephesians, which, as to time, were composed soon after one another? In that to

the Ephesians, or, if we may so call it, to the Asiatics and Phrygians, Paul speaks, if not unconcernedly, yet with quiet self-possession, respecting his undecided fate. Granted:—but this difference might be the effect of a few days; in the Epistle to Timothy, his first examination (in which, attacked by enraged enemies, he with difficulty escaped the sentence of death) had destroyed all his better hopes, iv. 14, 18.; but when he wrote to the Ephesians, no terrible scene of this sort had as yet dejected his mind. He first recommends himself to their prayers, that with intrepidity he might advocate the cause on account of which he lay in bonds. Ephes. vi. 18-21. Both compositions are consequently separated by this intermediate event: in that to the Ephesians he is as yet unacquainted with his danger; in that to Timothy it had exceeded all expectations.

The Epistle to the Asiatics and Phrygians is therefore a work of a previous, undisturbed, and collected state of mind, in the prison; here the most recent converts to Christianity more immediately arose to his mind, as well as the communities lately established, which he, in the last days of his liberty, inspected and conducted by his superintendance from Ephesus. The recollection of these flourishing societies filled him, on account of the blessed result of his mission, with joy and gratitude, and on the other hand, on account of their youthful condition, with solicitude, which excited him, in the hours of retirement and seclusion, to that precatory and solemn tone, which so distinctly appears in this circular Epistle. So much did the difference of condition effect!—repose with the agreeable recollections of active life on the one hand, and a shuddering at a danger, whose magnitude was not thoroughly perceived, on the other.

SECTION CXXXII.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

PHILIPPI was the first of the European cities, in which Paul preached. It was situated beyond the Strymon in that part of Macedonia, which formerly belonged to Thrace. Its situation and the adjacent landing-place from Asia to Europe is diffusively described by Appian[q]. By Luke (Acts xvi. 12.) it is called a Roman colony and the first city, πρωτη πολις, of this part of Macedonia; yet it was not so in rank, as Amphipolis had the preference [r], from its situation with respect to Troas, Acts xvi. 11. at the time that the Apostle first visited Neapolis. To remove this difficulty, we must have recourse to Epigraphical Archæology. The appellation [s] πρωτη πολις often occurs on coins, and indeed so frequently, that

[q] Appian de Bell. Civil. L. iv. c. 105—6.

[r] Livius. L. xlv. c. 19.

[s] Various illustrations of πρωτη have been given. Amphipolis was decidedly the chief city in that division of Macedonia, according to the distribution of Æmilius Paulus, nor could Philippi in any way exact precedence to it. Nor, was this place, as Bengelius argues, the first city on the Apostle's road, for that is particularly declared to have been Neapolis. Thus, Hug is partly correct in his explanation of the term from Eckhel; he has only failed in not having extended the word to its full signification. Πρωτος continually occurs in the sense of *præcipuus*, (which is mentioned by Eckhel) and corresponds to ראשון in every point of view. The chief oversight, however, seems to have been, that those who have criticized the passage, have neglected to observe the omission of the article, from whence Luke appears to describe it not *as the Metropolis*, but as *one of the principal* (A principal) cities in that division of Macedonia. This removes every difficulty.—*Translator.*

two or three cities of the same country, and of the same province, assume to themselves this title at the same time, which, according to numismatical explanations, denotes nothing more than the enjoyment of certain liberties and privileges, which are in no manner exclusive[t].

That it was a Roman colony, Pliny likewise confirms[u], and that in this capacity it enjoyed distinguished privileges, other records inform us. It was founded by[x] Augustus himself, or at all events considerably enlarged by him[y].

The Apostle was, at first, very well received here, and found willing dispositions and belief; through an accident however he was imprisoned, and ill treated, until he avowed himself to be a Roman citizen, on which he obtained his liberty. He then went to Amphipolis, Acts xvi. 12.

SECTION CXXXIII.

When he was afterwards a prisoner at Rome, the Philippians, who, in the mean while, must have become a flourishing community, still testified their gratitude, and sent to him support in his necessity, Phil. iv. 18. He wrote to them thanking them for it, and this Epistle is probably the last, which he composed in Rome. For in it he shows a clearer

[t] Eckhel Doctrin. Vet. Numm. P. 1. vol. iv. c. 6. p. 282.

[u] Hist. Nat. iv. 11.

[x] Dio Cassius. L. li. states that Julius Cæsar planted a Roman colony at Philippi.—*Translator.*

[y] Digest. Leg. viii. n. 8. In provinciâ Macedonicâ Dyrracheni, Cassandrenses, Philippenses.... juris Italici. Gfr. Walck. Dissert. in Acta Pauli Philippens. Jenæ, 1726. Cellar. notit. orb. Ant. T. i.

prospect of his deliverance than in any of the former, i. 12. 14.; he even meditated to allow Timothy his most confidential assistant to depart, ii, 19., and in a short time, ταχεως, to come himself to them.

SECTION CXXXIV.

The following are the contents; I thank God and am rejoiced at the increase of your knowledge and love. My concerns take such a favourable turn, that some were even induced by them to promulgate the Gospel—not always indeed from pure motives ; but be it so, Christ is preached, who is all unto me, i. 26. But behave yourselves as persons who are worthy of him, unanimous, disinterested, according to Christ's example, who humbled himself, and assumed the character of a servant, ii. 17. If it be my lot to die, I rejoice; however, the prospects of liberation daily become brighter, ii. 30. Value not yourselves on account of the circumcision; I could do the same; but Christ is all unto me, to be united with whom I only desire. Follow my instructions and listen not to false teachers, iv. 2. Remain stedfast in the Gospel, and friends to every virtue. I was overjoyed at your care of me, your bounty has always been pre-eminently shown. I and those with me salute you.

SECTION CXXXV.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

This writing, as its plan, its composition in particular parts, and almost each passage, evince to us, was written for Jews; and among them, for those, who were most minutely instructed in the ceremonies of the worship of God at Jerusalem, the ordinances of the Temple, and things appertaining to them. These deep points of learning and knowledge may indeed be vested in any learned Jew; but as to the greater number (for the author of the Epistle naturally composed it for such) they may only be expected in cases, where they can be acquired by frequent mental contemplation.

Chrysostom therefore having correctly surveyed the whole concluded, from the knowledge necessary to the comprehension of the Epistle, that it was intended for the Jews in Palestine. So also have all those imagined, who deem the Hebrew to have been the original language of the Epistle.

As clearly do the circumstances scattered through the Epistle, under which the author views the Christian community, to which he destined his composition, direct us to Palestine and Jerusalem. Some of their teachers and leaders had already distinguished themselves by an exemplary death from reverence to the faith, xiii. 7. This was also the fate of the first men of the Christian school,—of James and Stephen at Jerusalem.

The readers had already endured many struggles for

the sake of the truth; some had become a spectacle to the multitude under torments and abuses. Many had been placed in fetters, and suffered the plunder of their property and their fortunes, x. 32. 34. Such misdemeanours on the part of the public authorities, on account of religion, had not yet been witnessed except in Palestine, throughout the Roman empire, which, until the persecution of Nero did not deviate from its well known general toleration *.

All this had already befallen them; one thing only was wanting; they had not yet, as in the days of the Maccabees, Heb. xi. 34—39, fought for their religion at the expence of blood and life, xii. 4 *.

To such a pitch it had not yet arrived, even in Palestine; no executions and massacres had yet taken place in the nation; the hatred against Christianity had hitherto satisfied itself with few victims, with James and Stephen; not because the Sanhedrin wanted the will, but because it wanted the power under the Romans.

Those, to whom the Epistle was sent, were extremely inclined to apostacy; hence the author in many passages very forcibly represented to them the hazard of this step; the difficulty of retracing it in the event of it being taken, and the dangers attendant on it, iii. 7.—iv. 13.—vi. 3, 4.—x. 19—32. In many communities, indeed, there were continual complaints against the Jews, on account of the impetuosity, with which they defended the obligation of

* Gibbon's Hist. of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. i. chap. 2.

* That, among the multitude, executions and massacres had already taken place, is an erroneous supposition, nevertheless it is Eichhorn's principal proof, that the Epistle could not have been directed to Palestine. Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. Part II. § 266. p. 486.

their ordinances in Christianity. But such commotions as none of the Apostles, nor even James, could any more keep within bounds, and which publicly threatened the renunciation of obedience and the approaching dissolution of the Ecclesiastical Society, such a raging zeal for the law, which could have withdrawn from Christianity myriads of believers on the slightest occasion, were not perceived in Palestine until the latter days of Felix, Acts xxi. 17. 23. This circumstance, indeed, has given to the Epistle its whole subject and destination.

SECTION CXXXVI.

The Jewish religion was in Palestine particularly enticing and seductive, in consequence of its external pomp and its splendid ceremonies, which agreeably occupied the powers of imagination and all the senses; while, on the contrary, Christianity, simple and noiseless in its meetings, was only a retired assembly of quiet friends to virtue, without a High Priest, without an altar, without sacrifices.

The Jewish feasts were so many days of general rejoicing to the whole nation, where people met together from all parts of the country, and formed and established acquaintances; they engendered affection and fraternal feeling among the whole nation, and supported a national spirit without a parallel. Many of these festivals, as days commemorative of ancient benefits, aroused every feeling in favor of Moses and the law; others were consolatory, as the feast of expiation, when the High Priest appeared before the Deity in the inmost part of the sanctuary, and atoned for the sins of the whole nation.

All this the Christians had not, and all this must, in the opinion of the natives of Palestine, have subjected their religion to reproach. They could not satisfy, or long and permanently occupy many minds, which as yet were unprepared for the worship in spirit and in truth. When circumstances were added to this, such as persecution, enkindled patriotism, as was the case, when the last insurrection was gradually arriving at maturity, many readily resolved to abandon a religion, which did not seem to compensate them for that of their ancestors.

Hardships of this nature, which local circumstances immediately presented here, and caused to be sensibly felt, were those, which the author must have encountered, and respecting which it was necessary for him to satisfy the Jews, for the purpose of preventing their relapse. If they extolled above every thing the pre-eminence of the Law, which they had received by the ministration of angels [b] and by Moses, the Man of God, and reproached Christianity

[b] The author here alludes to the Jewish ideas, which he has cited shortly afterwards. Two passages occur in the New Testament (*e.g.* Acts vii. 53. Heb. ii. 2.) which have been applied to these opinions. But there can be no doubt that the notion originally emanated from a misunderstanding of the מלאך־הברית: hence, Chrysostom says, *πῶν ἀγγελοι νομον ἐφανησαν διαταττοντες; ἀλλα διαταχθεντα νομον λεγει, τον ἐγχειρισθεντα αὐτῳ δι' ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥ του ὀφθεντος αὐτῳ ἐν τῃ βατῳ.*

Some critics, however, have referred the term *ἀγγελοι* to the thunder, lightning, and other phænomena attendant on the delivery of the Law, which is not as probable as the opinion of those, who conceive the antient prophets to have been intended, in their capacity of messengers from God. The LXX have too far extended the use of the word for these passages to be positively determined by this version: yet, we may clearly infer, that allusion was made to the different revelations which Moses received, which were assigned by the older Jews to the מלאך־הברית. For when the later Jews introduce a plurality of angels at the delivery of the Law, they

with originating from a despised and suffering man,—if they censured it for having no offerings, no High Priest, and, which are so important to sinful men, no expiatory sacrifices, and no festival of atonement, and for not having all that, which rendered the religion of the Jews venerable and consolatory;—objections so important could not remain unanswered without the greatest prejudice to the good cause.

SECTION CXXXVII.

He therefore, on the contrary, shows (for, this is the subject of the Epistle) the superiority of Christianity to the Mosaic law, from the dignity of its founder, who is even higher than the angels, to whom the Jews ascribed the transmission of the Law to the author of the Jewish Constitution, ii. 12. But if he lowered himself, and sustained in his own person the infirmities of mortals, this only took place that he might become by so much a more merciful High Priest, iii. After this he shows his pre-eminence above Moses, the mediator at the delivery of the Law, and very earnestly calls their attention to the difficulty of returning, if they fall off from this Christ, iv. 14.

He now passes over to the High Priesthood, shows that Jesus was placed by the Deity in this dignity, and energetically warns them not in the slightest degree to venture a separation from him, vi. 20. Then he shows what sort of a High

violate one of their most established canons: אין מלאך אחד עושה שתי שליחויות ולא שני מלאכים עושין שליחות אחת: *Translator.*

Priesthood that of Jesus is; that he is not a priest from the Jewish classes of ministration, but from the class of Melchizedek, who in greatness even excelled their ancestor Abraham [c], and all his descendants, Aaron and the tribe of Levi; that Jesus is even before Melchizedek, a Priest of the New Covenant, exalted above every thing, who did not enter into the Holy of Holies by means of the blood of goats, to atone for the sins of the people, that he was not obliged to do this every year, like the High Priests of the Jews, that he had entered once only with his own blood, and by this offering had atoned for all men; that therefore for the future all offerings were unnecessary, and a new order of things, a new constitution, should exist, that the ceremonies of the law had been only figurative representations of that which is imparted in reality by the New religion, x. 19.

If therefore we have, through Jesus, a sure access to God, our punishment, if we thrust him from us, will be so much the greater. It will indeed require courage to remain true to him, but Faith will confer this. Faith, henceforth, is the way to Justification and union with God; or rather it has ever been such heretofore to all righteous and holy men, and shall be such to them; it shall strengthen them in their sufferings—xii. 12. They shall therefore approach another Holy Jerusalem and the Mediator of the New Covenant; they have another altar for offerings, another offering, which is Jesus, who died without the city, as formerly the expiatory offerings were burned without the camp.

[c] Abraham is certainly not the principal subject here, but he was indispensable to the purpose. According to the known proverbs of the Jews, the Messiah is greater than Abraham, Moses, and the ministering angels ירים מאברהם נשא ממשה וגבה מאד ממלאכי שרת.

SECTION CXXXVIII.

In what language was this treatise originally written? Several Christian Teachers maintain that it was originally composed in Hebrew, such as Clemens Alexandrinus and some more ancient, to whom Origen refers. According to Clemens Alexandrinus, Luke is said to have translated it into Greek, whence arose the similarity in tone and style between this Epistle and the Acts of the Apostles [d].

Origen is, however, disinclined to account it a translation, but he explains to himself its origin in a different manner. He is of opinion, that all the sentiments were delivered by the Apostle Paul, and were arranged and clothed by some one, who had heard these verbal statements [e]. Such is his opinion, about the validity of which he has no doubt.

To the best of his knowledge and persuasion, the Hebrew original text was not a fact historically proved. He was well informed respecting the opinions of the ancients on this subject, which he also calls to mind in this place; notwithstanding all which he abandoned them for the sake of substituting a conjecture in their place. Their allegation therefore, had no more value in his eyes than his own hypothesis, which he must have at least accounted as well founded, even if he did not give to it the preference.

He seems, however, (it will be said) to produce an historical authority; for, in putting to himself the

[d] Euseb. H. E. vi. 14. [e] Euseb. H. E. vi. 25.

question,—who may be the arranger of this writing and the author of it, as far as it relates to its compilation?—he expressly says, ἡ δε εἰς ἡμας φθασασα ἱστορια, that the history which has descended to him decides in favour of Luke or Clemens Romanus.

However, ἱστορια does not here mean *history*, but it is accepted in the general sense—in that of *information*. "The Epistle, according to the testimony of the ancients (this is the context in which he explains himself) is referred to Paul; but as to the person, who gave to it its written form, God only knows the truth. The ἱστορια of some has descended to us, who say, that Clemens Romanus put it together; and also that of others, who account Luke to have committed it to writing." If some tell a different story from others, and God alone knows the truth of it, the expression ἱστορια cannot here be accepted for *history*. Moreover, ἱστορια does not extend to a Judaic or Non-Judaic original text, but only refers to the question,—who, in case Paul only furnished the ideas which another wrote down, can this other be, to whom this merit might be attributed?

The declarations of the ancients (as they are called) are therefore only conjectures, which were hazarded in explanation of the difference in the style of writing, which they conceived themselves to have remarked in the Epistle to the Hebrews, compared with other treatises of the Apostle, and as such they do not restrict our investigations in the slightest degree.

According to internal proofs, the original writing was certainly not Hebrew. In the second chapter, 7, 8, the author quotes the passage from Psalm viii.: "WHAT IS [f] MAN?—YET THOU HAST PLACED ALL

[f] The whole of this criticism is incorrect and unsupported, and as far as the verse is here cited, it is incapable of affording an argument

THINGS UNDER HIS FEET, παντα ὑπεταξας ὑπο τῶν ποδων αὐτοῦ. To this ὑπεταξας, *thou hast placed under*, he alludes in a series of sentences, v. 5. οὐ γαρ τοῖς ἀγγελοις ὑπεταξε την οἰκουμενην, v. 8. ἐν γαρ τῷ ὑποταξαι αὐτῷ τα παντα, οὐδεν ἀφηκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυποτακτον—ὁρωμεν αὐτῷ τα παντα ὑποτεταγμενα.

Now, the word ὑποτασσειν does not exist in the Hebrew, but is expressed by circumlocution; *thou placedst or layedst under his feet,* כל שתה תחת רגליו. If

in favour either of a Hebrew or a Greek original text. That ὑποτασσω occurred in this verse in the LXX, and that it was warranted by the Hebrew, were sufficient authority for its retention by a translator, and if the Epistle had been written by St. Paul in the Palæstinian dialect, it were natural to expect his translator to conform himself, as much as possible, to the phraseology of the LXX, on account of its currency among the Hellenists and Greek Christians. But Hug denies its existence in the Hebrew, and yet gravely quotes כל שתה תחת רגליו. What then is שתה תחת, but ὑπεταξας ὑπο? and if the one corresponds to the other, what argument can be established on the recurrence of the word, in the other instances which he has quoted? שום in Daniel vi. 14. is similarly interpreted.

But, had Hug taken the whole quotation into his argument, he might have found in it a presumptive evidence, that this Epistle was written in Hebrew. The first chapter asserts and vindicates Christ's Divinity, maintaining the *inferiority* of the angels to him, which subject is likewise pursued in the second, and in corroboration of this species of proof, the present quotation from the 8th Psalm is adduced, which, as it stands in the LXX and our Greek text, is subversive of every thing, which has preceded it. But in the Hebrew we find the term אלהים, which reconciles this apparent contradiction, and is consentaneous to the antecedent reasoning: this the LXX rendered ἀγγελοι, from which version we know that the ancient Hellenists rarely varied, except in quotations from memory, consequently the translator of this Epistle would adopt it in conformity to the general custom, and having adopted it, would retain it in any argument established upon it, as for instance in the ninth verse: although this adoption and retention (supposing the Epistle to have been written in Hebrew) could never prove אלהים not to have been St. Paul's expression in the original. See p. 98 of my Sermons before the University of Cambridge.—*Translator.*

then he wrote in Hebrew, and quoted the text in Hebrew, the whole reference to the words of the text is lost, and the passages derived from or referring to ὑποταξας become impracticable in Hebrew, through the repetition of the whole paraphrase. Could he indeed have written this ?[g] Thou hast placed all things under his feet; but as to the angels, he placed not the universe under their feet; for, as he placed all things under his feet, he excluded nothing, which he did not place under his feet: we see, therefore, that every thing was placed under his feet.

In the viiith chapter he begins to speak of the promises of God respecting a New Covenant. For this he quotes, as proof, Jeremiah xxxi. 31, 32. where God promises a ברית חדשה, *a New Covenant*, one different from that, which he had established with the ancestors of the Jewish nation; and he proceeds to argue, that a New Covenant, ברית חדשה καινη διαθηκη, depreciated and weakened the old one. This succession of ideas he continues in chapter ix., and describes the Ritual of the Old Covenant, opposing to it the Priest and Mediator of the New one; vers. 14, 15.

We see from the subject, that the technical word ברית must have been chosen for the covenant with Abraham and the fathers, if the author wrote in Hebrew. But as he quoted Jeremiah, to whose words the chain of his sentences is linked, and whence they

[g] If, as we have proved, the word corresponding to ὑπεταξας be in the Hebrew text of this Psalm, the whole of these objections fall to the ground. Consequently, there is no periphrasis, but merely a simple translation. As to the impracticability of rendering the Apostle's words into Hebrew, every one, who has the slightest knowledge of Hebrew grammar, must be convinced of the fallacy of the assertion: for if it were impracticable in Hebrew, it were necessarily also impracticable in the Syriac, Arabic, and Æthiopic versions, in which, notwithstanding, ὑποτασσω has its corresponding terms.—*Translator.*

proceed as inferences, much more was he obliged to retain the word ברית, and in the inferences to work upon the expression of the Prophet. The supposition, that the author might perhaps here have used the word ܩܝܡܐ, will therefore not deceive us.

ברית means a *Covenant;* but another sense, to which the author of the Epistle soon after transfers

[b] With respect to the extended sense, in which St. Paul used ברית, it must be remembered, that the Jews in later times considered many legal engagements to be included under the term: thus, in Sanhedrin. f. 1011. we read of שלשים ושש בריתות *thirty-six*, and it is reasonable to suppose, that St. Paul accepted the word, as it was accepted in his day. In Numbers xviii. 19. and other places, it stands so intimately connected with the Divine Promises, that we may without violence conceive an easy metonymical transition from the one sense to another, which had relation merely to human promises and engagements. Be this, however, as it may; the author's preceding arguments in favour of the prevalence of the Greek in Palestine are sufficient to show, that דיתיקי may, at the period when this Epistle was written, have been adopted in the Palestinian dialect, of which we have collateral evidences from the Targumin and the recurrence of ܩܝܡܐ in Syriac. If then we call to mind, that the Jews conceived a man's last Testament to be a Covenant or ברית, and observe the Arabic translator rendering this controverted passage عهد الوصيّة and عهد توصيّة *Testamentary covenant*, and moreover notice the Rabbinical writers resorting to דא תהי קיים as the derivation of דיתיקי, we cannot accuse the Apostle of impropriety in passing from the one word to the other, much less can we hence argue, that the Hebrew was not the original language of this Epistle.

From this light, in which a Testament was regarded far and wide in the East, the Koran enumerated testamentary duties among the Divine Statutes, and regarded it as a bond, which the legatees were compelled to observe, which notion it doubtless retained from the opinions of the ancient Arabs. Not only therefore from this universal respect paid to Testaments, may we suppose the Apostle to have considered the διαθηκη as a ברית; but we may still further retrace its classification under it to the Laws of inheritance in the Pentateuch, which the Jews comprised under this general term. —*Translator.*

it, viz. that of *Testament*, on which account Jesus died, because such only becomes valid in consequence of the death of the testator, it confessedly has not. If, however, he wrote Greek and originally quoted the Greek translation, the word διαθηκη was the correct expression. It comprises not only the first, but likewise the second signification of Testament; but it really contained the data for the reasoning, which he founded upon it and which could not arise from the Hebrew.

In the xth chapter, 4, 5. he proves that henceforth the ancient offerings have ceased. For this he refers to the xlth Psalm vers. 7., where a person, whom he accounts the Messiah entering into the world, addresses God;—Thou requirest no offerings, but thou hast formed for me a body—that I may fulfil thy will. Thence, he continues, the ancient offerings are of no more avail, and ποιησαι θελημα the fulfilment of the will is commanded instead of them, vers. 9, 10. Conformably to this will, ἐν ᾧ θεληματι, Jesus once for all presented the offering of his body την προσφοραν τοῦ σωματος as a general expiation from sin.

The argument turns upon this passage: Thou wouldest not offerings, but gavest to me a body, to perform thy will, σωμα κατηρτισω μοι. This will, Jesus accomplished through the offering of his own body, δια την προσφοραν τοῦ σωματος, consequently the passage was fulfilled and all other offerings cease. Formerly the offerings were numerous, πολλακις προσφερων, vers. 11. for all these the single offering sufficed μια θυσια, μια προσφορα, vers. 12, 13., which was for ever satisfactory, εἰς το διηνεκες, vers. 14.

The offering of the body, προσφορα τοῦ σωματος, this single offering instead of all, μια προσφορα, refers to the words of the Psalm, σωμα κατηρτισω μοι, thou gavest

to me a body. But the Psalm in the[1] Hebrew text contains nothing about a body, but says: "Thou

[1] Surenhusius seemed inclined to resolve this difficulty, by presuming ברית (*κατηρτισω*) to have existed in some MSS. for כרית, and by substituting נוף for אזנים: but unfortunately no authority supports him in his inclination:—*ὠτια* certainly occurs for *σωμα* in several Codices, and became the reading in Origen's Hexaplar. Ludovicus Cappellus says, "*σωμα δε κατηρτισω μοι*, in Hebræo autem est, *aures perforâsti mihi*, h. e. mancipâsti me tibi in perpetuum, nempe, juxta legem, quæ est Exod. xxi. 6. Videntur autem LXX. scripsisse *σωμα δε με κατηρτισω σοι*, h. e. *mancipâsti me tibi*, nam *σωμα* Græcis interdum mancipium significat, unde illud,

σωματα πολλα τρεφειν, και δωματα πολλα ἐγειρειν."

Lambert Bos deemed *ὠτια* to have been the original reading, which being written *continuâ serie*

ΗΘΕΛΗCΑCΩΤΙΑ

became corrupted into

ΗΘΕΛΗCΑCCΩΜΑ

the transcriber having, according to his conjecture, carelessly resolved the T and I into M, and then added another C. Kohler, also, pronounced *ὠτια* to have been the original reading of the LXX.

Another question, however, may arise on this subject:—were both in the ancient Hebrew MSS.?—was one of the two lost from the copies, whence our present Hebrew text is taken? We discover in the Æthiopic ፡ሥጋኀ፡አሠጠሕ፡ሊ፡ት፡ *he purified thy flesh* (*body*) *for me*, but in the Arabic we observe both واعددت لي جسداً فتحت مسامعي *and thou hast prepared for me a body: thou hast opened my ears.* Did the Æthiop alter the words, as they stood in the version, whence he translated them for the sake of making both Testaments uniform? or did the Arab retain both, for the sake of avoiding the difficulty altogether? This, indeed, never can be decided; yet, if *σωμα* be the true reading of the LXX, we must necessarily suppose it to have sustained some injury, such probably as Cappellus suggests, which the Æthiopic in a certain degree confirms. But, *ὠτια δε κατηρτισω μοι* and *σωμα δε με κατηρτισω σοι* will signify the same thing—*i. e. mancipâsti me tibi.*

We must likewise remark, that in the Epistle to the Hebrews Cur-

hast bored mine ears," אזנים כריתל ׳, and in a Hebrew composition, the offering of the body deduced from the citation, and all that is afterwards said about a single offering which rendered all others superfluous, would not be established in its major proposition. It was only the Greek text of the Psalter, which furnished the argument and secured its correctness.

But even the supposition, that these words were spoken at that time of the Messiah, or that they refer to that moment *when he entered into the world,* διο εἰσερχομενος εἰς τον κοσμον λεγει, vers. 5., is again founded upon the words, "*Thou hast formed my body,*" without which words there exists no indica-

cellæus received ὠτα at ver. 5. and αἱματος for σωματος at ver. 10.: that in the former Griesbach noticed ὠτια (Syr. post. in m.) and that White found it on the margin of the Philoxenian version, which he edited from the Ridleian Codex,—that in the latter, τοῦ αἱματος according to Griesbach was sanctioned by D*. E. Clar. Germ. || = 73. Since then there are these variations in the passage in the New Testament, since Jerome found ὠτια in the LXX, as is apparent from his version, and Cyril and Arnobius likewise found this reading in that version, a Copyist not understanding the Jewish legal allusion contained in ὠτια may have written σωμα in the margin, which gradually found its way into the text, and in process of time displaced the original reading. In this case the Translator of St. Paul would probably adopt the reading then current in the LXX; yet from the varia antes lectiones at the 10th v., it is manifest, that no proof, that Paul *must have written* גוף or σωμα, can thence be deduced, as Hug infers. Both expressions being equivalent in signification, his chain of argument will not be affected, whichever be retained, consequently the inference, which might be derived from the one, will also follow from the other. Nor are the words διο εἰσερχομενος κ'. τ'. λ'. founded on the selection of σῶμα, as Hug alleges; they are rather naturally deduced from the Psalmist's words, הנה באתי ־־־־ לעשות רצונך אלהי which if the Psalm be referred to the Messiah, evidently point out the time stated by the Apostle. Therefore, Hug's arguments respecting this reading and its necessary proof of the language, in which the Epistle was written, fall short of the demonstration, which the author ascribes to them.—*Translator.*

tion, that this passage is to be understood, as relating to the entrance of the Messiah into this mortal life.

SECTION CXXXIX.

We have scarcely attained the end of one difficult question, ere another still more difficult awaits us: for it relates to the author of this treatise. It is in the collection of Paul's works, but by what *right* does it occupy so honourable a place?

If the peculiarity of the ideas and their combination, if the mode of thinking be a clue to the discovery of an author and to the recognition of him, as the composer of a work, this writing *according* to my judgment is by Paul. The ideas, which constitute the fundamental matter in the Epistle to the Hebrews, all existed in the mind of Paul, and were in unison with his train of thoughts, whence *they* passed over into his other writings. They have frequently penetrated into the connection of other ideas, but have not received this circumstantial development, because they were not, as in *this* instance, the objection in question, but secondary ideas connected with others.

One of the principal views, from which he *considered* the institutions of public worship and ordinances of the Jews, (for such it peculiarly was) according to the guidance of which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews applied all these enactments to Christ and his religion, does not only appear in the Epistle to the Colossians, but is even there laid down in the same words, with which the Epistle to the Hebrews represents it. All these things, (Paul says there), are only σκια των μελλοντων, Coloss. ii. 17.; so here

also they are only accounted σκια των μελλοντων ἀγαθων, Heb. x. 1., viii. 5., as ineffectual symbols of salvation and forgiveness, types or shadows of things, of which the coming religion should contain the truth, viz. the thing itself[k].

Paul has occasionally given specimens of these modes of application, from which we may observe in what manner the development must have taken place from this view according to his ideas, and in how great a degree the whole mode of treatment in the Epistle to the Hebrews is according to his genius. He represents to us (Romans iii. 25.) our sanctification through the death of Jesus by a type from the rites of the Jewish worship, and says, that

[k] This declaration (because even Philo establishes a like principle: τα μεν ῥητα των χρησμων σκιας τινας ὡσανει σωματων εἰναι, *de confus. ling.*) is the chief reason, whence the Epistle to the Hebrews was lately declared to be an Alexandrian production. Eichhorn's Introduction to the New Testament, 3rd vol. 2d part, § 259, p. 442. As if Paul in the Epistle to the Colossians had not proceeded from the same idea; ἁ ἐστι σκια των μελλοντων, το δε σωμα του Χριστου. Secondly, as the Alexandrians subjoined a secret sense to the histories of the ancient Jewish world, and referred the events to a higher object, so does the Epistle to the Hebrews proceed. But in this he is not singular, as we perceive from 1 Cor. x. 1—6. and 11., and from Rom. v. 14., where Adam on account of the universality of the consequences, is a type of the Saviour, τυπος του μελλοντος, cf. 1 Peter iii. 20, 21. Both the ideas are therefore not exclusively Alexandrian; they are also Pauline, and we observe in them the learned education and opinions of the age, of which Paul makes use, both among and against his cotemporaries. What could be more like Philo than the ἀλληγορουμενα, Galat. iv. 21—31., compared with Philo de Cherubim, *init.*? to which I have referred in the first part, Section 5., for the sake of concluding from the spirit of the age in the adduction of proofs and treatment of the sacred books, to which days the Pauline Epistles come nearest. Lastly, this scholar quotes also particular phrases, in which Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews approximate to each other, p. 447. But this coincidence not only occurs in that of the Hebrews, but in all the Epistles of Paul, as may be easily expected between cotemporaries.

God has set him up[1] as the operculum of the ark of the covenant, which on the feast of expiation was fumigated (with incense) and sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifices, (yet may we also explain, if we chuse, the word ἱλαστηριον as an offering of expiation) that he might blot out sin in his blood. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, v. 2. he invests the death of Jesus in a priestly allusion, by means of which he offered himself up for us and brought himself as "an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savour," consequently he was at the same time a Priest and a sacrifice.

We shall not also find typical significations strange to the Hebrews, if the tabernacle be an emblem of the entrance of Jesus into the holy of holies in Heaven, ([m] Heb. viii. 3. 6. ix. 24.) and if we

1 Ἱλαστηριον, in the New Testament, generally implies (as Hug also admits) a propitiatory victim or sacrifice, and on this signification, Chrysostom, Origen, and several of the fathers strongly insisted. This sense may, indeed, be derived from Lev. xii. 13. 15, 16.

But Hug seems to prefer that of *propitiatorium*, and in his paraphrase of the Apostle's words manifestly has borne in mind Philo's and Theophylact's definition of it, (το πωμα της κιβωτου) the first of whom *(de profugis, p.* 465.) explains it to be in its ulterior or typical sense μιμημα της ἱλεω Δυναμεως. Theodoret, however, on this chapter, thus describes the ἱλαστηριον of the Jewish sanctuary:—το ἱλαστηριον πεταλον ἡν χρυσοῦν· ἐπεκειτο δε τῃ κιβωτῳ· ἑκατερωθεν δε εἰχε τα των Χερουβιμ ἐκτυπωματα. Ἐκειθεν τῳ Ἀρχιερει λειτουργοῦντι ἐγινετο δηλη τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ εὐμενεια.—*Translator.*

[m] Types of one description or another prevailed in every symbolical religion. The Jews probably were inclined to them before Moses, for it is evident that the Ægyptians were from the most unfathomable antiquity addicted to figurative representations of celestial things. The Thalmudists indulged similar notions both of the tabernacle and temple, which have been repeatedly cited, and not only they, but also the followers of Zerdusht accounted *"every thing on earth a type and shadow of things in Heaven!"* Hence as we may be convinced from an inspection of the Persepolitan monuments, the فروہر was the πρωτοτυπος of the human soul. Cf. Sir R. K. Porter v. i. p. 657.

perceive (1 Cor. x.) the passage through the Arabian sea treated as a type of baptism, &c. as a τυπος, the former there being ἀντιτυπα των ἀληθινων.

This principle and the interpretations deduced from it, are in the earlier Epistles of the Apostle only casual traits, which are rather noticed than detailed, which nevertheless prove, that the contemplations, with which the Epistle to the Hebrews so amply abounds, were at a much earlier period formed in his mind, that they already existed in it, and would have proceeded from it in precisely the same manner, if his object had required him to treat more extensively of them.

Paul, when he considered the ancient ceremonial institutions merely as shadows, to none of which a pardoning efficacy belonged, became bound to answer the question, whence forgiveness and the Divine mercy were obtained, and had been obtained by worthy men of old, if no medium were provided for

So also in the other instance adduced from the first Epistle to the Corinthians, the Cloud, which attended the Israelites in their migrations, was esteemed a type of Baptism by the Jews. Hence we read in Pirki Eliezer, c. 44. אלא כל שהיה צריך טבילה היה הענן מטפליטה. We moreover remark the manna called in different writers מזון רוחני *spiritual food*, and probably in allusion to Ps. lxxviii. 25. מזון מלאכותי *angels' food*. In like manner, the rock mentioned in the context is said by Rashi to have emitted *spiritual waters*, מיים דוחניים היו, and an anonymous Rabbi apud Bartenoram enters into a long detail of its miraculous properties, among which we find that it followed the congregation, to which St. Paul has by some been conceived to allude. We might adduce a longer series, but these will suffice to show, that the Jews had somewhat similar ideas on the subject.

The Syriac version (it may however be noticed) states this typical baptism to have been performed ܒܡܝܐ whence the Æthiopic proceeded to the absoluteassertion ኵሎሙ፡ አጥመቀ ሙ፡ ሙሴ፡ በደመና፡ ወበባሕር። that *Moses baptized them all* in the cloud and in the sea.—*Translator.*

them in the Law. Had not satisfaction been given on this point, the preceding would have been inconsistent, and the solution of the question would belong to a theory, without which it could have no existence.

This was peculiar to him and had often been declared by him. For, he asserts, that this was not a result of religious actions under the Jewish dispensation, but of faith, της πιστεως. With this word he connected a particular idea, such as none of the other Apostles did. Πιστις referred to επαγγελια, to a Divine annunciation of institutions appointed for human happiness, and is the confidence and unshaken hope, that they will be fulfilled, Rom. iv. 16—18. 20. Gal. iii. 5., &c.

This notion of the Apostle is a fundamental idea of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and constitutes a considerable part of its contents, (c. x. 38.—xii. 4. *and in several passages besides.)* In the same manner as the Apostle has elsewhere described it, elucidated it by accessory ideas, and adorned it with proofs, so it appears in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Paul delineated it, Rom. viii. 24—26., in a periphrasis, as hope, in opposition to that which is seen and perceived; ελπις βλεπομενη ουκ εστιν ελπις—ο ου βλεπομεν, ελπιζομεν, etc. In the Epistle to the Hebrews this delineation is comprised in a definition, xi. 1. ελπιζομενων υποστασις πραγματων ελεγχος ου βλεπομενων.

This, according to Paul, secures to us a preference over the professors of every religion, ινα καυχωμεθα επ' ελπιδι Rom. v. 2. In Heb. iii. 6. it guarantees to us likewise a καυχημα, which he calls καυχημα της ελπιδος.

From this confidence full of hope he and the author of our Epistle understood the scriptural passage; "the just shall live by faith," Gal. iii. 2.

Heb. x. 38. In consequence of this it happened, according to both, that Abraham and Sarah, persons dead with regard to procreation, obtained a son, Rom. iv. 19.; Gal. iii. 7.; Heb. xi. 12. It, (this πιστις, which was built on the ἐπαγγελια) was that, which made him the friend of God before the law, and which has become an example and medium of forgiveness for all in the law, &c.

Thus they coincide in the same notion of faith, in its [n] reference to the ἐπαγγελια, in its justifying consequences, in the proofs and patterns in confirmation of the maintained inefficacy of the law and the legal institutions; and merely differ in this respect, that the Epistle to the Hebrews contends for it through a number of examples, νεφος μαρτυρων; that πιστις, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, is opposed in strong terms to the law and to the ἐργα νομου; but that in the Epistle to the Hebrews this harsh antithesis is avoided and enveloped in forbearance, that in the other Epistles πιστις εἰς Ἰησουν Χριστον is absolutely defended as the only means of justification, but that in this, it is defined, and expected from the reader as an inference, without any conclusion being distinctly drawn.

Origen, therefore, had a very correct view of it, when he maintained, that τα νοηματα μεν Παυλου εἰσι: for in reality this composition contains the views of the Apostle, his ideas, and not merely detached ideas, but a whole series of them on one subject.

We also find here his figures and favorite expressions: we will, for instance, only cite those, which

[n] It is true, that Paul connected πιστις with ἐπαγγελια, but not that this is his exclusive idea, in the use of the word. Various examples of its more extensive sense in his Epistles may be seen in Schleusneri Lexic. *in voce.*—*Translator.*

refer to instruction. The word of God in Paul is a *sword*, Ephes. vi. 17. so also it is in Heb. iv. 12. Instruction for beginners and weak persons is *milk*,—for strong persons it is βρωμα and στερεα τροφη, *strong food*, Heb. v. 13.; 1 Cor. iii. 2. The first are νηπιοι, 1 Cor. iii. 1.; Heb. v. 13.; their subjects of instruction are στοιχεια, Galat. iv. 9.; Heb. vi. 12. But the grounded in the faith, on the contrary, are τελειοι, Heb. v. 14.; 1 Cor. xiv. 20., and their condition is τελειωτης, Coloss. iii. 14.; Heb. vi. 1. Whoever now is farther inclined to compare the Apostle's choice of terms respecting the work of redemption, the allegorical turns and phrases of which he has made use in explanation of it, will here also again discover Paul.

Besides the ideas and metaphors, a number of Paul's favourite words and phrases are conspicuous in this discourse, some of which the diligent Wetstein has collected [o], whose collection has been subsequently considerably augmented [p].

SECTION CXL.

As the internal reasons declare so plainly and emphatically in favour of Paul, it does not seem probable, that we have to fear a different result from the historico-critical investigation. We must, however, make it our law not to decide from individual declarations or detached testimonies: but impartially to form and pronounce our opinion from an inspection of the whole history of our Epistle.

Eusebius, when he exhibits the ideas of the an-

[o] Nov. Test. T. ii. p. 886.

[p] Chr. Frid. Schmid. Histor. Antiq. and Vindicat. Canonis, § 249. p. 262—65.

cients respecting that which is called the Canon, includes, among the Biblical books which were generally acknowledged to be genuine, the fourteen Epistles of Paul at that time comprised in the MSS. of the New Testament, without a reservation, as to one of them [q]. It is not to be denied, that in this his view was more directed to the Greek and Oriental communities than to the Latin. For they were those with which he must have been best acquainted with regard to their opinions and convictions, on account of his language, residence, literary education, and the libraries (at Cæsarea and Ælia Capitolina) whence he derived his documents. But besides this passage he has explained himself more clearly in another. "Fourteen Epistles of Paul (he says) are generally acknowledged and authentic, προδηλοι και σαφεῖς, yet, I must not here conceal, that some depreciate that to the Hebrews, under the pretext, that the Roman Church objects to it [r]." Whether these SOME may be LATINS, which is not to be expected in this connection, or these τινες may be Greeks; it is unimportant, as far as it regards the main point. In the first case, it has no reference to the general opinion of the Greeks, and in the second case it is only an exception to the common sentiments of the Greeks, which existed in individuals, from respect or prejudice in favour of the Romans, and which presupposes, according to the acknowledged *exceptio firmat regulam*, that the Greek Church, taken as a whole, did not think, as these SOME thought, respecting the Pauline origin of the Epistle, but that on the contrary it recognized it.

Jerome, who had certainly read a great number

[q] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. c. 23.
[r] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. 3.

of the writings of Christian Greece, did not therefore exaggerate, when he maintained in the letter to Dardanus, that it ever had been decided by *all the* Greek writers, *ab omnibus retrò Ecclesiasticis Græci Sermonis scriptoribus*, that Paul was the author of the treatise to the Hebrews.

Origen expresses himself just as explicitly respecting THE ANTIENTS;—this word, when used by a man in the third century, receives a signification of great authority, and seems to approximate us to the days of the Apostles; "not without reason," (says he) "have the antients transmitted to us this Epistle as a work of Paul [s]."

Before and after him, witnesses from the Alexandrine school appeared in favour of this document. Dionysius, who is known from his researches respecting the Apocalypse, as an intelligent and impartial teacher, decides here in favor of Paul [t]. Clemens, earlier than both defended the Pauline origin of this Epistle.

At Alexandria they also did not proceed so easily and inconsiderately in investigations of this nature. This city, as it is well known, always possessed a great number of able grammarians, who labored with critical acumen on the writings of the antient classical authors, improved the text where it had suffered, and separated, according to critical principles, authentic works from spurious.

This critical genius extended itself also to the books of the New Covenant, and to this Epistle by name. It was soon observed, that its style was strikingly different from the language of Paul.

[s] Οὐ γαρ εἰκη οἱ Ἀρχαιοι Ἀνδρες ὡς Παυλου αὐτην παραδεδωκασι. Euseb. H. E. L. vi. 25.

[t] Euseb. H. E. L. vi. 41.

Notwithstanding this observation, which seemed to consign it without hesitation to another composer, nobody ventured to decide it not to have been written by the Apostle. So great was the conviction, that it could not be shaken by good arguments against it.

Ways and means were devised to harmonize these points. The hypotheses of Clemens and others, of which Origen speaks, and then his own, which the latter added to them, are so many attempts to reconcile the difference of style with history and the declarations of past ages, which were in favor of Paul.

Clemens, in particular, quotes to us a more antient assertion of an illustrious teacher to this effect. He calls him *the deceased old man,* (who, according to the connexion of the discourse, is Pantænus,) who investigates the cause of Paul not prefixing his name and his title, ἀποστολος to this Epistle[u]. I must here confess, that I cannot conceive how it was possible, that in more modern times an Alexandrian could have been proposed as the author of the Epistle, since, in the Alexandrian church itself, the decision in favor of Paul approximates so closely to the first century. Where should it be better known than at Alexandria, if the Epistle was composed by any Alexandrian?

To invalidate the testimony of Pantænus, it has been recently asserted, that he had, respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews, doubtfully proposed to himself the question, "Why does not Paul call himself an Apostle in it?" It is surprising, how a scholar of this eminence could have written any

[u] Clem. Al. Hypotypos. apud Euseb. H. E. L. vi. c. 14. according to Rob. Steph. p. 62.

thing so hastily. Did Clemens or Origen ever entertain any doubt about the Epistle, because they proposed questions to themselves on the subject? Did Julius Africanus, and others before him, doubt respecting Matthew and Luke, because they inquired into the cause of their difference in the genealogy of our Lord? Long before him, Tatian, when he was yet at Rome and yet orthodox, drew up Biblical προβληματα, which he, and after him Rhodon, promised to solve [x]. This must have taken place more at Alexandria than any where else, where they were accustomed to προβληματα and ζητηματα Ὁμηρικα, λυσεις ζητηματων Ὁμηρικων and the like propositions. Let us, as it is reasonable, return to the assertion of *the deceased old man;* he says, "Because the Lord was sent among the Jews (Heb. iii. 1.) as Apostle of the Almighty, Paul, as his mission was especially directed to the Gentiles, was too modest to sign himself Apostle to the Hebrews, from reverence to the Lord, and though, from exuberance of zeal, he sent forth the Epistle to the Hebrews, he was still an Apostle and Herald to the Gentiles." That which Pantænus is said to have doubted, he here supposes not to be doubted; that Paul wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, but that for two reasons he refrained from the customary introduction, "PAUL THE APOSTLE," etc.

In Lower Ægypt the Epistle to the Hebrews maintained its rank immediately after that to the Galatians, until about the fourth century, as we see from the numerical succession of the chapters in the *Codex Vaticanus* [y]:—not before the times of Athanasius was it placed after the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, where it occupies its place in the

[x] Euseb. H. E. L. v. c. 13.

[y] Hug, de Antiquitate Codicis Vaticani, pp. 23, 24.

Ægyptian books. In the version of Upper Ægypt it stood even before that to the Galatians, immediately after the second to the Corinthians [a], which is worthy of remark as to the elucidation of the ancient opinion of Ægypt.

Jerome adds to his preceding account of the agreement of the ancient Greek teachers, also that of the Oriental churches [a], to which he was for a long time a neighbour in his solitary abode at Bethlehem. His statement is confirmed by the assertion of Augustin, that the Epistle in the Oriental churches occupies its rank among the canonical writings [b].

Ephræm, Syria's most illustrious teacher, refers in many places to this essay; adding also the character, which suits the author, under the appellation of THE APOSTLE [c]. Jacob of Nesibis, Ephræm's teacher, composed in the third century, several Syriac works, some of which have reached us in an Armenian translation. In these he refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the designation of the author as THE APOSTLE and THE LATE APOSTLE [d].

Shortly after the middle of the third century, we find in Upper Syria not merely individual teachers, but an assembly of teachers, viz. the Synod of

[a] Zoëga, Catalogus Codicum Copticor. in Museo Borgiano l. iii. Codd. Sahid. N. LXXX. p. 186. Engelbrecht, Fragmenta Basmurico-Coptica, p. 25.

[a] Nostris dicendum est, hanc Epistolam, quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab Ecclesiis ORIENTIS, sed ab omnibus retrò Ecclesiasticis Græci Sermonis Scriptoribus, quasi Pauli Apostoli, suscipi.—*Epistola ad Dardan.*

[b] Ad Hebræos quoque Epistola, quamquam nonnullis incerta sit .... magis me movet auctoritas Ecclesiarum Orientalium, quæ hanc etiam in canonicis habent. *Expos. in Epist. ad Rom.* t. iv. *Opp. Edit. Basil.* p. 1180.

[c] Ephræm Opp. Syr. t. i. p. 400.

[d] Galland. Biblioth. Patr. t. v. 16. and p. 88.

Antioch, which sent to Paul of Samosata, before his removal, a summons, in which it refers to the Sacred Writings, and among them cites the passages, Heb. ii. 14. iv. 15. and xi. 26 [e]. In the second century we appeal to the oldest translation of the Syrians, as a monument of their faith and of their convictions with regard to the canon; this, however, although it excludes some of the Catholic Epistles from its Codex, contains nevertheless the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, as we have before proved, where we spoke of this translation, is a genuine and an original part of it.

If we consult the heretics, we know that Manes, whose school extended itself particularly in Syria and Mesopotamia, referred to the authority of this Epistle, for the purpose of proving his assertion, that the Old and New Testaments do not derive their origin from one and the same author [f].

The Melchisedekians, originating from Theodotus, (ἀργυραμοιβος or τραπεζιτης) elevated Melchisedek above Christ, and borrowed their proofs for it from the Epistle to the Hebrews, Heb. vii. 3. and vii. 4. 7 [g]. In the second century, the Montanists, who made their appearance in Phrygia, and afterwards repaired towards the West, did the same. These founded their principal doctrine of distinction on the Epistle to the Hebrews, vi. 4., as we shall soon see.

[e] Mansi, Collect. Concil. t. i. p. 1034.

[f] Epiphan. Hær. LXVI. § 74. Ed. Petav. εἰτα παλιν λεγει ὁ αὐτος Μανης, οὐ δυναται ἑνος Διδασκαλου εἰναι παλαια και καινη διαθηκη· ἡ μεν γαρ παλαιοῦται ἡμεραν ἐξ ἡμερας, ἡ δε ἀνακαινιζεται ἡμεραν καθ' ἡμεραν· πᾶν γαρ παλαιοῦμενον και γηρασκον ἐγγυς ἀφανισμου γινεται. Heb. viii. 13.

[g] Epiphan. xxxv. seu LV. § 1. Hebr. vii. 3. § 8. Heb. vii. 4. 7. cf. Tertullian, *de præscript. towards the end.*

In this long-sanctioned dignity and veneration these writings remained, free from attack, in the East and among the Greeks; and until the times of Arius no Ecclesiastical society among these nations was known to have contradicted the Epistle. The Arians were the first among the Greek Communities, whom history accuses of having denied it to have been by Paul [h].

This circumstance confers no little weight on the assertions of Eusebius, where he speaks in favour of the Epistle, and recommends his historical character, which was not misled to be unfaithful to history, from inclining to one party. Theodoret also referred the Arians, respecting this Epistle, to the example of this their fellow-believer, that they might edify themselves and learn moderation from it [i].

* * * * * *

The primitive ages of the Church at Rome afford to us an illustrious witness for this Epistle, viz. Clemens, who there mounted the chair of the Apostles after their death. In his Epistle to the community at Corinth, he quotes passages from it, as Eusebius and Jerome have already observed, and as we ourselves may perceive, from the treatise which has descended to us. He does not indeed cite it with the name of the Apostle, but without mentioning the author, makes use of this writing with the author's own expressions, αὐτολεξειχρησαμενος, and *juxtà verborum quoque ordinem* [k]. But he has pointed out the author by name in no book of the New Testament from which he has borrowed passages, except in the first Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, because his

[h] Theodoret. Prolog. in Epist. ad Hebr. Epiphan. Hæres, LXIX. § 27.

[i] Theodoret. Prolog. in Ep. ad Hebr.

[k] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. c. 58. Hieronym. in Catal. v. Clem.

essay likewise was directed to them, and a reference to the Apostle by name was very conformable to the subject and circumstances. From the citations, which Clemens has taken from the Epistle to the Hebrews, we would first of all conclude no more than Eusebius; ὁτι μη νεον ὑπαρχει το συγγραμμα. But we must call to mind, that Eusebius, in his statement of it, seems modestly to have cast a polemical side-glance at the Western Church, to which he opposes the Greeks, which corroborates the most ancient Ecclesiastical monument of Rome, that they did not account the Epistle as a more modern writing, but that they reckoned it among the other works of Paul; ὁθεν εἰκοτως ἐδοξεν αὐτο τοις λοιποις ἐγκαταλεχθηναι γραμμασι τοῦ Ἀποστολοῦ.

Irenæus also in the book, περι διαλεξεων διαφορων, has given extracts from it [l], yet we know not whether they were given with the name of the author; but, on the other hand, in the books against the heretics he has so carefully avoided the application of it, that here and there only faint traces of it are perceptible [m].

Whence can we explain the strange conduct of the Greek Teacher in this last work? I believe that it may be justly explained from the times and circumstances of his life. His ecclesiastical connexions linked him to the Westerns, among whom he acted with reputation and authority. These were actively employed by means of the sect of the Kataphrygians, or Montanists. He himself had, on account of these, executed commissions from the Gaulish communities to Eleutherus, at Rome [n], ere he had yet composed his hæresiological work [o]. The third Book of

[l] Euseb. H. E. L. v. c. 27.
[m] Massuet Dissertat. in Iren. D. iii. art. 11. n. 7.
[n] Euseb. H. E. L. v. c. 47.
[o] Massuet Dissertat. ii. art. H. 47.

it was not written before the latter times of Eleutherus, and the whole first appeared under his successor.

These now (the Montanists) defended their dogma, that they who had become guilty of very grievous crimes, could no more be admitted into the Church, from the Epistle to the Hebrews, c. vi. 4, 5. This was one of their most distinguished proofs, as we conclude from Jerome[p].

But even without his testimony the actual singularity in the conduct of a zealous Montanist must convince us of it. Tertullian vigorously defended, from Heb. vi. 4. 5, the Montanist doctrines, in his book *de Pudicitiâ*, which he particularly composed in favour of their assertion, and insisted on this passage with a degree of application, that he bestowed on no other of his arguments.

If therefore the Teachers of the Latin Church made use of the Epistle with diffidence and distrust until they finally rejected it, history furnishes us with causes, which render this conceivable. For, that it was difficult to answer the argument, the different attempts which the ancients made to that effect might inform us.

Irenæus had perhaps not been long dead, ere a loud opposition to the Epistle, on the part of the Roman Church, ensued. Caius, (Γαΐος) one of its Presbyters under Zephyrinus, declared, without hesitation, in a controversial work, that he only admitted thirteen Epistles of Paul, but that he did not consider that to the Hebrews as a work of the Apostle. The controversial work was directed against the Montanists,

[p] L. ii. adv. Jovinian. n. 3. Verum ne Montanus et Novatus hic rideant, qui contendunt non posse renovari per pœnitentiam eos, qui semel sunt illuminati, &c. Heb. vi. 4, 5.

and principally against Proculus, one of their most learned defenders, *της Καταφρυγιας αἱρεσιως ὑπερμαχοῦντα*. This circumstance again perfectly explains to us the cause of this Epistle being so troublesome to him, and of his so decidedly denying it.

Henceforward, the greater part of the Latins adopted these opinions, and from this event until the fourth century, their decision continued to be against Paul [q]. History, however, is not aware, that they were so unreasonable as to deprive the Epistle of the honour of the Apostolic age, and to deny to it a composer of that time [r]. How could they, when the treatise of Clemens Romanus was in so many hands? But the author of the remarkable fragment in Muratori, who places himself about the time of Caius, alone makes an exception to it, and was wild enough to call the Epistle *apud Alexandrinos Pauli nomine fictam ad hæresin Marcionis* [s]. Thus, that a self-opinionated man might maintain his orthodoxy, the Apostle himself must submit to become a Heretic.

Even the Montanists relaxed, and in their polemical writings admitted the Epistle so far only, as they

[q] Euseb. H. E. L. vi. c. 21. *ἠλθε δε και εἰς ἡμας και Γαϊου λογιωτατου ἀνδρος διαλογος ἐπι Ῥωμης κατα Ζεφυρῖνον προς Προκλον· .... ἐν ᾧ .... τοῦ ἱεροῦ Ἀποστολου δεκατριων μονων ἐπιστολων μνημονευει, την προς Ἑβραιους μη συναριθμησας ταις λοιπαις· ἐπει και εἰς δευρο παρα Ῥωμαιων τισιν οὐ νομιζεται τοῦ Ἀποστολου τυγχανειν.* Hieronym. in Catal. V. Caius. In eôdem volumine (disputatione advers. Proculum) epistolas Pauli tredecim numerans, decimam quartam, quæ fertur ad Hebræos, dicit ejus non esse; sed et apud Romanos usque hodiè Pauli non habetur. Cf^tur Photius, Cod. 48.

[r] Hieronym. Catal. V. Paulus. Philastr. de Hæres. c. 88. Primasius comment. Præf. in Ep. ad Hebr.

[s] Tom. iii. Antiqq. Ital. med. ævi. p. 854. That he understands by it the Epistle to the Hebrews, is proved by the adjoined citation, Heb. xii. 15, by which he characterises it.

were inclined to acknowledge its authority; viz. as a work of an Apostolic Teacher, such as Barnabas, Clemens, &c. So did Tertullian, who had already, under Zephyrinus, witnessed these commotions and the attempt of Caius, and who soon succeeded Proculus in reputation and erudition, and became his most ardent admirer; *Proculus nostræ virginis, senectæ, et Christianæ eloquentiæ dignitas.* He therefore (to return again to our subject) when Paul's right to this Epistle was disputed, accepted it for that which it was accounted to be, and urged his arguments and proofs so forcibly, that he, nevertheless, placed it on an equality with Paul in authority and value, or, at the least, next to him.

This passage is remarkable, and shows us how he endeavours to retrieve in one place, what he yields respecting Paul in another, and to retrace the Epistle at least indirectly to Paul. "Volo ex abundantiâ "*alicujus comitis apostolorum* testimonium superin- "ducere idoneum confirmandi *de proximo jure dis-* "*ciplinam magistrorum.* Exstat enim et Barnabæ "titulus ad Hebræos, adeò satis auctoritatis viro, ut "quem *Paulus juxta se posuerit* in abstinentiæ te- "nore; aut ego solus et Barnabas non habemus hoc "operandi potestatem? Est utique receptior apud "Ecclesias epistola Barnabæ, illo apocrypho Pastore "mœchorum. Monens igitur discipulos omissis om- "nibus initiis ad perfectionem magis tendere, nec "rursum fundamenta pœnitentiæ jacere operibus "mortuorum, impossibile est, inquit, illos qui semel "illuminati sunt, *(et rel.)* Hebr. vi. 4, 5. . . . . Hoc "*qui ab Apostolis didicit, et cum apostolis docuit,* "nunquam mœcho et fornicatori *secundam pœniten-* "*tiam promissam ab Apostolis nôrat.*" *De Pudicit,* c. 20.

Both parties were thus contesting, when in the

ardour of the controversy the Montanists were reinforced by a new party. The circumstances became more urgent and the orthodox had no time to reconcile themselves to the Epistle. Nearly about forty years after the declaration of Caius, the Novatians arose at Rome on the death of Cornelius. They renewed the assertion of Montanus respecting repentance, and called themselves THE PURE. As soon as they had adopted his dogma, they also appropriated his proofs to themselves, and the chief passage, on which they prided themselves, was again Heb. vi. 4, 5.

Jerome has already drawn our attention to it above [t]. Augustin in quoting it refers to the Novatians, whom he calls *Mundos* (Καθαρους) and refutes their opinion of repentance founded upon it [u]. Epiphanius considers these words as the chief source of their error [x]. Theodoret accuses them of arming themselves with it in defence of untruth, and opposes to them his own interpretation [y]. Macarius the Egyptian adds to the words Heb. vi. 4, 5., others also of this Epistle, which in the same manner had been misinterpreted κατα Ναβατιανων φρονημα [z]. Abúlfaraj even exhibits to us a Novatian speaking, who proved his opinion from hence [a]. Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, by means of an extensive discussion in the book against the Novatians has analyzed this

[t] Hieronym. Ep. ad Dardan.

[u] Augustin. de verâ et falsâ Pœnitentiâ. C. 3. L. iv. opp. edit. Basil. 1559.

[x] Epiphan. Hær. lix. de Catharis. σφαλγει αὐτους το ῥητον τοῦ Ἀποστολοῦ εἰρημενον, το ἀδυνατον τοῦς ἅπαξ φωτισθεντας, κ'. τ'. λ'.

[y] Theodoret. Comm. in Ep. ad Heb. c. vi. ταυτα οἱ Νουατου κατα της ἀληθειας ὁπλιζουσι ῥητα.

[z] Macarii Monachi opusc. iii. de Pœnitent. Galland. Biblioth. P P. T. viii. p. 32.

[a] Histor. Dynastiarum, p. 137. *Arabic Text.*, and p. 86 *Latin.*

passage and defended it against their declaration, of which Photius has given us a very copious extract [b]. So much was this the chief argument, that it required and employed the opposition and acumen of the most celebrated teachers.

The conduct of the two Churches was therefore very different upon the same subject; the Greeks attempted to evade the argument by means of the interpretation; and the Latins rejected the whole. The cause of this is contained in the circumstances. The Greeks were more peaceable and less disturbed spectators; whereas the theatre of these controversies was among the Latins and in Rome, in the midst of which the Heads of the parties appeared. They had no leisure to look on, until an exegetical attempt might be successfully opposed to the contesting party. They were consequently obliged, whilst the Greek Church was supporting the Epistle, notwithstanding the Heretics regarded it as their principal polemical instrument,—to avail themselves of the most ready expedient in their situation and to act as they did,—to contradict the Epistle, the subject of which they could not answer—or to be overcome in the contest. This was the real cause of their conduct, and if Philastrius in his honesty confesses, that the Public and Ecclesiastical use of the Epistle was interdicted, on account of the Novatians [c], he should therefore no longer be treated with harshness.

Is it then a subject of surprize, that Cyprian, who had so many struggles on account of the re-admission of the lapsed, does not mention the Epistle in a

[b] Photius Cod. 280, p. 880. Ed. Hoeschelii.

[c] Philastr. adv. Hæres. c. 88. non legitur .... de pœnitentiâ propter Novatianos.

single syllable, and rather appears ignorant of its existence?

There is also no doubt, that Hippolytus did not admit it: he cannot however be considered here as a Greek, or, (as some prefer) an Oriental; for Irenæus guided his judgment upon this subject, and the work, in which his declaration appeared respecting this treatise, was his History of the Heresies, which he for the most part wrote, ὁμιλοῦντος Εἰρηναίου [d].

Meanwhile, such serious fermentations among the Latins could not long remain unknown to the Greeks, and it is easy to be imagined that *some* (τινες,) as Eusebius states, partook of their opinions, and on the authority of the Church pronounced the sentence of rejection.

But what indeed were the reasons of the Roman Church? Was it solely the pressure of circumstances, which they wished and were forced to conceal by specious arguments; or, were the Montanist and Novatian commotions, which indeed had visibly and undeniably their share in it, probably the sole occasion of a rooted opposition, which was only enkindled and enflamed by this event? Did they or Caius produce ancient declarations of credible men? did they produce authentic historical testimonies and securities, which decided against Paul, or in favour of another author?

In that case, the controversy must certainly have received quite a different aspect; however, far from referring to the *Traditio Ecclesiarum*, to authorities of the earlier Church, as an historical problem required, and as it was customary in questions re-

[d] The chief passage relating to this is in Photius Cod. 121. p. 161. Hoeschel. where Photius independently of Gobar derived the subject from Hippolytus himself.

specting the Canon and articles of faith, they gave a totally different turn to the investigation. In the whole Latin Church, there is not one teacher celebrated in history for his penetration and literature, who was acquainted with any such *Traditio Ecclesiæ*, or with an historical ground: the whole contest rested exclusively upon internal criteria.

The Epistle, (they said), is an anonymous composition, in which Paul, contrary to his custom, no where mentions himself, from which consequently we cannot specify its composer . Its style is different from that of the Apostle in elegance and rhetorical parade, which he despised[f], and if, notwithstanding this, it should belong to him, it can only be a translation from another original text, in which Paul originally wrote it, and is therefore inadmissible in every dogmatical proof[g]. Moreover, citations from the Old Testament occur in it, which are no longer to be found in the Prophets and other Canonical books of the Jews[h].

These are the principal arguments, which the Latins urged, when they wished to maintain their objection ; others, as for instance, *quia addiderunt in eâ quidam non bene sentientes, et quia factum Chris-*

[e] Ad Hebræos . . . ubi principium salutationum de industriâ omisit; . . . . unde nonnulli eum in Canonem Scripturarum recipere timuerunt. Augustin. Exp. in Ep. ad Rom. Tom. iv. opp. Ed. Basil. 1556. p. 1180. Primasius Utticens. Præf. in Comment. Ep. ad Hebr.

[f] Non ejus dicitur propter Styli Sermonisque dissonantiam. Hieron. Cat. V. Paulus. Quod rhetoricè scripserit, et sermone plausibili. Philastrius. Hær. c. 61.

[g] Hilar. Pictav. Tract. in Psalm. ii. n. 4.

[h] Hieron. Comment. in Isaiam. L. iii. c. 6. T. iv. opp. p. 97. Valars.

tum dicit, &c. are, as it is clear, not to be compared with these.

By such pretexts the Latins justified their conduct, and they, who, in other cases, well knew how to establish their proofs from tradition, in this case never wasted a word upon guarantees of antiquity or documents of earlier teachers. In short, history has, according to its best knowledge and consciousness, never produced a testimony against Paul; and the whole contest has been exclusively conducted upon exegetical grounds, the examination and decision of which is in our own power, and on which we are ourselves able to decide.

On the other hand, the two teachers, Jerome and Augustin, who with their extensive literature and reading, outweighed all the West, were convinced by the testimonies of the ancients. They even placed before their cotemporaries the *traditio* of the Greeks and Orientals, and attempted by it to give a different direction to the general opinion. The result would not perhaps have met with success, if they had been unable to render the decision respecting it valid by means of an Ecclesiastical Council. It was the third or fourth council of Carthage, over which Augustin had great influence. It noted in its list of the canonical books *Pauli Epistolas tredecim, ejusdem ad Hebræos unam*, as the decision of the Church.

From this time the Latins coincided, and Innocent in the Epistle to Exuperius at Toulouse, determined, upon the question concerning the Canon, that there were fourteen Epistles of Paul. Thus it became still further customary in the Roman and Latin Churches, and the objection died away every where, excepting in Spain. At least Isidore of Seville entertained scruples about it, as late as in the 7th cen-

tury. He is, however, the only one, with whom such are still found. Therefore the Western nations depreciated the Epistle, from force of circumstances, then they palliated their conduct, by reasons collected from all parts, and after the storm of party-spirit had subsided, they reinstated it in its right.

SECTION CXLI.

The author has, at the end, added such circumstances, that no one, who was acquainted with his connexions, could easily mistake the Apostle in them. He promises his readers, that he would visit them with Timothy, who, in other places, was constantly in the society of Paul, as his pupil and his assistant, and was at Rome his fellow prisoner. He mentions him as one released from the prison; he adds greetings from Italy, by which his present residence is named, and his preceding, in the prison of the capital, is likewise shown. This was, at the time when the fate of the Apostle was known, much more demonstrative than it is now, and the words, ἐαν[1] ταχιον ἐρχεται, were then generally understood, whereas at present they admit of a manifold meaning. At all events, Paul was recognizable from these expressions, at the end of the Epistle.

But why did he not prefix his name, if it was Paul who composed the treatise? Clemens Alexandrinus answers the question in the following manner:— "When Paul wrote to the Hebrews who were prejudiced against him, he cautiously did not prefix

[1] Chrysostom ὁμιλ. λδ'. p. 1972. says on this passage, οἶμαι αὐτον εἰς δεσμωτηριον ἐμβεβλῆσθαι· ἡ εἰ μη τουτο, ἀπο Ἀθηνῶν ἀπολελυμενον. —*Translator.*

his name, lest he might deter them." It was, certainly, a better precaution [k] for all those, who received this writing with prejudice, for them first to read it, examine it, impartially judge it, and come to a conclusion respecting it for themselves. If they, having perused it, gradually conjectured towards the end from circumstances, and finally arrived at the certainty, that it came from Paul, the contents had become already known to them, the ideas had been imbibed, had fastened themselves on the mind, and had taken effect.

We have a second answer to this from Pantænus. He is of opinion, that the customary salutation, as we read it at the beginning of Paul's Epistles, PAUL THE APOSTLE, &c. could not well have been prefixed to an Epistle to the Hebrews, since, with reference to them, he could not assume the appellation of APOSTLE, without offence, § 140. Paul had certainly renounced the Apostolic vocation, as far as it regarded Palestine, and by an express agreement took possession of the Heathen countries as the circle of his occupations and the district of his mission, Gal. ii. 9, 10.; but to call himself the Apostle of the Gentiles in a hortatory Epistle to the Jews, were neither suitable nor commendatory.

A third answer is contained in the contrivance of the treatise itself: he begins with a rhetorical introduction, and has in general as little in common with an Epistle, as the speech pro lege Manilia. As far as the Doxology, xiii. 21. he maintains it continually in the style of a rhetorical composition.

Immediately after this conclusion, an addition follows, which embarrasses the judgment, whether the oration be not probably designed to be an Epistle?

[k] Euseb. H. E. vi. 14.

Whether now this tone be intentional, for the purpose of avoiding in the beginning the greeting, and consequently the name, APOSTLE; or whether it was chosen from other motives; suffice it, that the prefixed greeting, after the manner of an Epistle, would have been an error in style, compared with the Introduction and the form of the whole.

All these answers have a strong foundation; no one excludes the other; nothing therefore prevents them from being all true, if, indeed, a reflecting man can arrive at a decision by means of several arguments at one and the same time.

SECTION CXLII.

BUT whence arises the difference in tone, and the dissimilarity of language in comparison with his other writings? In the Epistles of Paul the same spirit indeed prevails, but not the same tone throughout. In the Epistles to the Corinthians, let us hear the offended teacher, conscious of his dignity and merit, circumspect, benevolent, serious, and vehement: in the Epistle to the Romans, the scholar, maintaining a dignified distance, abounding in Judaic learning, as the advocate for the Gentiles,—in that to the Galatians, let us hear the language of paternal consideration towards an unpolished people, which is inclined to works of supererogation [1]. How very different is the tone of the Epistle to the Romans from that to the Galatians on a very similar subject! That to the Ephesians is solemnly devout; that to

[1] *Welches des Guten zu viel thun will.*

the Philippians is replete with affection and condescending dignity, that to the Hebrews is written elegantly, and with exaltation of the mind. The situation, in which he was, the relations in which he stood to the communities, are expressed most faithfully in each of his Epistles.

Let us consider him in his relation to the inhabitants of Palestine, he was not one of the Teachers and Fathers of their societies. He could therefore never adopt that tone, which became him towards communities, which he had himself established, fostered, and matured.

If we go back to himself, it becomes intelligible from his fortunes, why the Epistle to the Hebrews is distinguished by a more pleasing description, why at the very beginning it assumes an oratorical style, and why throughout it has received the structure of a work of eloquence. Now finding himself free and happy in the new possession of a life half lost, he reflects this feeling on his communication by an easiness and terseness; and having been, for a long time led about from one tribunal to another, and having been obliged to be his own advocate and speaker, he perfected himself in a fluency which was ready to be applied to the first occasion.

If we consider the project, which occupied him, to weaken thoroughly the impression of the splendid services of the temple in Palestine, the solemn offerings and gorgeous festivals, by exhibiting the whole of this to be existent in Christianity, not sensibly and transitorily, but spiritually and in a higher perfection,—the unity of the materials led him to the tone of a treatise or oration.

Thus, if we regard the whole subject, it demanded a more lofty tone. The Apostle in the beginning

speaks of Jesus as an [m] image (eradiation) of the Godhead; of his elevation above the Angels, and above the whole Creation; of his dignity, as the Son,

[m] Ἀπαυγασμα, Heb. i. 3. This is one of the words, from which this Epistle has been presumed to have been translated by an Alexandrian. Suidas and Phavorinus deem it to be synonymous with ἐκλαμψις—ἀπαυγη. The passage is equivalent to Col. i. 15. where Christ is called εἰκων τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀοραρου: it more emphatically denotes his derivation from the Divine essence, yet in a sense totally different from that imputed to it by the Gnostics. The Fountain of Deity is the αὐγη, and He is the ἀπαυγασμα, from whom conjointly proceeds the ἐκπορευσις of the Holy Spirit. Hence they are joint participants of that Essence, as Gregory Nyssene (*de perfec.* p. 25) maintains, τῷ μεν ἀπαυγασματι το συμφυες ἐνδεικνυμενος· τῷ δε χαρακτῆρι το ἰσοστασιον. Thus argued all the Orthodox Fathers: Theodoret, *in loco*, says, το ἀπαυγασμα και ἐκ τοῦ πυρος ἐστι, και συν τῳ πυρι ἐστι· και αἰτιον μεν ἐχει το πυρ, ἀχωριστον δ' ἐστι τοῦ πυρος· ἐξ οὐ γαρ το πυρ, ἐξ ἐκεινου και το ἀπαυγασμα..... ..... ἐξ οὐ γαρ ἡ δοξα, ἐξ ἐκεινου και το ἀπαυγασμα· ἀει δε ἡ δοξα, ἀει τοινυν κ.τ.λ. το ἀπαυγασμα· και τῷ πυρι δε ὁμοφυες το ἀπαυγασμα, οὐκουν και ὁ υἱος τῳ πατρι;—and after a recapitulation of similar arguments in another work (Epist. Div. Deer. c. 2. p. 256.) he concludes, that το ἀπαυγασμα της δοξης διδασκει το συναϊδιον.

We find the word once used in the Apocrypha (Σοφ. Σαλ. vii. 26.) ἀπαυγασμα γαρ ἐστι φωτος ἀϊδιου, και ἐσοπτρον ἀκηλιδωτον τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐνεργειας, και εἰκων τῆς ἀγαθοτητος αὐτοῦ, which may very aptly be compared to the verse in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In both these places, the Arabic has used the same word شعاع, which is abundantly expressive: the Syriac has used in the Apocrypha ܐܫܬܒܘܫ, which rather implies *blaze of light*, and in the other instance ܙܪܥ, a *germen* or *ray*, where the Translator evidently alluded to the prophecies respecting him, as the צמח דוד. The phrase itself appears common among the Jews, therefore no exclusive argument can be founded upon it. We read in various parts of Onkelos of נגה יקרא αὐγη τῆς δοξης, in Bereshith Rabba, 53. 52. 3. of נגה איקונין αὐγη τῆς εἰκονος, and of קלהתר פנים (*al.* קלהטר) καλλος τοῦ προσωπου, (by which εἰκονος is intended,) in several Talmudical works, whence it was probably an expression familiar to the nation, when the Shekinah (to which these passages allude) was the subject of discussion, and consequently was appropriately applied to our Saviour in an Epistle directed to the Hebrews.—*Translator.*

and Creator of the world. He then proceeds to speak of the Founder of Judaism, of Moses and of his institutions for the establishment of a religious state ; after that, of the High Priesthood, and of all, which made the religion externally splendid, and worthy of regard as to internal consolation. He speaks of the highest things known to the Jew, and for each of them shows one still higher in Christianity. Paul could not have possessed that sound judgment in the choice of tone, which was so peculiar to him, had he adopted any other than the higher and rhetorical style. This, however, as every one knows, cannot be attained without rounding and elevating the language to the beautiful.

If we would suppose, that Luke had influenced the expressions, what even then could be advanced against them? He at this time was raised so high in the confidence of the Apostle, that his co-operation in more elegantly finishing the treatise would readily be conceivable.

SECTION CXLIII.

THERE is therefore nothing opposed to Paul; it is his language, but it is his more dignified language, which the subject, the relative circumstances, and the principles of style required from him. On the contrary, every thing is in his favour, and secures to him the treatise as a property, which is in the following manner connected with the other parts of his history.

He had arrived from his travels in Palestine, at a time when Christianity there had reason to apprehend a dangerous crisis, as the apostacy of the Jews there

could scarcely be stopped. Acts xxi. 20, 21. Fame had depicted him as a determined innovator and adversary to Moses, and excited the general ill-will. He fell the victim to it; he was seized in a commotion, which broke out against him, was sent to Cæsarea, until he was taken to Rome, there to receive his sentence according to his desire, Acts xxii. xxiii.

Under such sad aspects as to the duration of Christianity in Palestine, he quitted it; perhaps under the melancholy reflection, that there, where by many a struggle at the expense of blood and sufferings, the school of Jesus was established, supported, and grown to a very numerous society,—in a short time, nothing of Christianity would be visible. This was the comfort, which he took with him to Rome; this was nearly the prospect of futurity, which accompanied him thither.

His fate, however, took a favourable direction. He was acquitted; his character in civil life was never equivocal; he therefore could no longer appear as a criminal and a transgressor against the Laws of his Fathers, even in the eyes of his enemies. One fruit of his acquittal was, that he could now again speak of his doctrines to those, who had before regarded them as audacious and punishable. He therefore assumed his former activity, and endeavoured to oppose the evil, which had already for a long time afflicted him, to strengthen the wavering in Palestine, to encourage those who had remained true, and where it was practicable, to recal the relapsed.

It was an extremely difficult task, which he had undertaken. As yet, not long acquitted, he might excite the former accusations against him, if he, with vehement frankness, as he had been accustomed, maintained the unprofitableness of the old religion; and

then it was to be apprehended, from the disposition of his readers at that time, that he might for ever incur their aversion, and accelerate the very step, which he wished to prevent. But whatever he conceded to them, he yielded to truth, to his own principles and conscience. Paul knew how to unite both; he did not for a moment deviate from his convictions and his old doctrines, yet he granted to them all, that they demanded. They might desire offerings and days of expiation, altars for sacrifices, and High-priests, yet was he so far from investigating the justness of their requisitions, that he seemed to comply with all; but, on the other hand, he showed, by happy turns, that they were already in possession of all this in the religion of the Christians, that Christianity was nothing else but the most sublime Judaism, by the side of which the grosser Judaism of past time must entirely vanish. And indeed it disappeared wholly, whilst he was proving, that all its excellences existed in Christianity in the highest degree and in the purest sense. Thus they might deem themselves perfect Jews in the school of Jesus, until they had understood the religion of Jesus in Spirit and in Truth; and then they first saw to their surprise, that they were no longer Jews, and that they never were; and as he had substituted for every sensual requisition a spiritual idea, so were they worshippers in spirit, without even knowing it.

The more I become acquainted with the writings of the Apostle, the more am I tempted to account the Epistle to the Hebrews, as his master-piece. It bears the seal of perfection, just as those to the Thessalonians denote the commencement of his career as an author.

In this manner did Paul avail himself of his acquittal, and of the first days of his recovered liberty,

and wrote this treatise, whilst he was yet in Italy, Heb. xiii. 24., after his liberation at Rome, which, according to our researches into the Acts of the Apostles, happened in the beginning of the tenth year of Nero.

CHAPTER III.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

SECTION CXLIV.

THE didactical compositions of the Apostles were divided into two collections; the one contained the Epistles of Paul, and bore commonly the title Ἀποστολος; the other comprised the Epistles of the others, and was superscribed: Καθολικαι ἐπιστολαι, or Καθολικαι ἐπιστολαι τῶν Ἀποστολων.

This latter title appears more frequently in Origen; but he applied it exclusively to the first Epistle of Peter, although the second was also known to him, and to the first of John, without imparting it to the second and third [n].

In the same manner also, Dionysius Alexandrinus only calls the first Epistle of John, την καθολικην ἐπιστολην, and when shortly afterwards he also speaks of the other two, he uses the expression φερομενος [o].

The phraseology of Origen, and the passage of Dionysius, which seem to place in opposition to each other the καθολικος and φερομενος, *the Catholic*

[n] Το ἀπο τῆς Ἰωαννου καθολικης ἐπιστολης οὑτως εἰχον. Tom. xvii. in Matt. p. 797. ὁπερ παραστησομεν και ἀπο τοῦ Ἰωαννου καθολικης ἐπιστολης. In Jerem. Tom. ix. p. 181., Tom. iii. Opp. Edit. Ruæi., Tom. ii. in Joann. p. 76., Tom. xx. in Jo. p. 323., Tom. iv. Opp. Ruæi.

[o] Noesselt. Conject. ad Hist. Ep. Jacobi, as a Supplement to Knapp. Dissert. in c. ii. Jacobi.

and the supposed, give authority to the opinion, that the expression καθολικη ἐπιστολη denoted a general writing, acknowledged to be authentic, in opposition to a supposed or doubtful one. A very eminent scholar inferred it from these assertions of both Fathers, and confirmed it by the following words of Eusebius. "The first Epistle of Peter (says he) is generally acknowledged; but the Acta of Peter, his Gospel, his Sermon and Apocalypse, are not among the Catholic writings [p]."

Catholic and generally acknowledged, καθολικος and ὁμολογουμενος, not Catholic and doubtful, would therefore be, according to Eusebius, synonymous. At first sight nothing seems to be more correct; yet it is by no means the idea, which Eusebius connects with καθολικος.

In another place he says exactly the contrary: "He used," (thus he speaks of Clemens Alexandrinus) "also the controverted books, namely the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic Epistles [q]." Still more plainly however does he previously explain himself, where he asserts, that the Epistle of James, one of the *Catholic, as they are called,* was also esteemed spurious, as well as the supposititious one of Jude, which is also one of the seven *Catholic* Epistles [r]. Consequently Catholic is, according to his idea, so far from being an opposition to suspected or controverted, that it is rather also applied to a great part of the writings, which are comprised among the controverted.

In Dionysius also the opposition between καθολικος

[p] H. E. iii. 3.

[q] H. E. vi. 14.

[r] H. E. iii. 23. Τοιαυτα και τα κατα τον Ἰακωβον, οὐ ἡ πρωτη τῶν ὀνομαζομενων καθολικων ἐππιστολων εἰναι λεγεται. Ἰστεον δε, ὡς νοθευεται μεν . . . . ὡς . . . Ἰοῦδα, μιας και αὐτης οὐσης τῶν ἑπτα λεγομενων καθολικων, κ. τ. λ.

and φερομενος is not so established. He produces doubts against the Apocalypse, and, among other things, makes the accusation against it, that John i. 9. speaks of himself in it by name, which is unprecedented in his other writings. Then he arranges the comparison in its order by way of proof. In the Gospel he is silent respecting his name: the Catholic Epistle he opens with the words, what we have heard, seen, etc. In the supposed Epistles, (so he continues after some intermediate sentences,) he only calls himself the Elder[a].

The opposition between the writings of John collectively and the Apocalypse is here the chief point; but the object and connection of things did not require, that they should all be brought into opposition one with the other. Every one of them must have been quoted under a certain title, which was all that was necessary to the representation of the idea, which he had asserted.

The statement respecting the Catholic and the supposititious Epistles is also too much separated by the insertion of an intermediate idea. To effect a contrast in the statement, we cannot separate from each other the objects to be compared by long intermediate discourses, without destroying the effect, which we wish to produce. According to

[a] Euseb. H. E. L. vii. c. 25. Ὁ μεν γαρ Εὐαγγελιστης οὐδαμου το ὀνομα αὐτου προεγραφει, οὐδε κηρυσσει ἑαυτον, οὐδε δια τοῦ Εὐαγγελιοῦ, οὐδε δια τῆς Ἐπιστολης· . . . ὁ δε Εὐαγγελιστης οὐδε τῆς καθολικης ἐπιστολης προεγραψεν αὐτοῦ το ὀνομα· ἀλλα ἀπεριττως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ το μυστηριον τῆς θειας Ἀποκαλυψεως ἠρξατο, ὁ ἠν ἀπ' ἀρχης, ὁ ἀκηκοαμεν, ὁ ἑωρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοις ἡμῶν. Ἐπι ταυτῃ τῇ ἀποκαλυψει και ὁ Κυριος τον Πετρον ἐμακαρισεν, εἰπων· μακαριος εἰ, Σιμων Βαρ Ἰωνα, ὁτι σαρξ και αἱμα ουκ ἀπεκαλυψε σοι, ἀλλα ὁ Πατηρ μου ὁ Οὐρανιος· ἀλλ' οὐδε ἐν τῇ δευτερᾳ φερομενῃ Ἰωαννοῦ και τριτῃ καιτοι βραχειαις ἐπιστολαις Ἰωαννης ὀνομαστὶ προκειται.

Grammatical arrangement, therefore, the intention of an opposition is not at all perceptible.

But even if we would admit, that Dionysius has used φερομενος in opposition to καθολικος, it would be only his own term, not the ecclesiastical, upon which it depends, if the question be, "what the inscription, καθολικαι ἐπιστολαι, signified in the Biblical Codex?"

Eusebius expressly names the first Epistle of John in the class of the generally acknowledged works of the New Covenant, την φερομενην Ἰωαννου προτεραν, where it certainly is not opposed to καθολικος, in the sense already proposed [1]. The ancients never applied the term CATHOLIC to other acknowledged and undoubted books of the New Testament, which certainly must have belonged to them, if it designated the idea of that, which was generally acknowledged. They never assigned to the Gospels, to the Acts of the Apostles, and to the 13 Epistles of Paul, this predicate, which was peculiarly adapted to them.

It is and remains therefore a technical expression for one class of Biblical writings, which possesses it exclusively, and communicates it to no other; namely, for that class, which comprised in itself the didactical compositions of the Apostles collectively, with the exception of Paul, καθολικως, i. e. καθολου και συλληβδην.

When the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles constituted one peculiar division, the works of Paul also another, there still remained writings of different authors, which might likewise form a collection of themselves, to which a name must be given. It might most aptly be called *the common collection*,

[1] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. c. 25.

καθολικον συνταγμα, of the Apostles, and the treatises contained in it, κοιναι and καθολικαι, which are commonly used by the Greeks as synonyms.

For this we find a proof even in the most ancient Ecclesiastical language. Clemens Alexandrinus calls the Epistle, which was dispatched by the Assembly of the Apostles, Acts xv. 23. the CATHOLIC EPISTLE, AS THAT IN WHICH ALL THE APOSTLES HAD A SHARE, την επιστολην καθολικην των Αποστολων απαντων [u]. Hence our seven Epistles are CATHOLIC, or Epistles of *all* the Apostles, who are authors.

The above adduced passage of Eusebius contains also this sense, who seemed to oppose *Catholic* to *Doubtful*, for, according to all his other assertions, nothing else could have been his meaning. "The first Epistle of Peter (thus has he expressed himself) is generally acknowledged, but the Acta of Peter, his Gospel, his Sermon, and Apocalypse, are not among the Catholic writings." For he mentions the class in which these supposed works of Peter should be placed (since the collection of the Historical and the Pauline writings was concluded) if they were authentic, and belonging to the Canon,—*i. e.* according to his notion they should be placed in that, into which the writings of the Apostles were generally distributed. So also has Origen adopted the expression, when he applied it to the Epistle of Barnabas, γεγραπται δε εν τῃ Βαρναβᾶ [x]

[u] L. iv. Strom. c. xv. p. 512. Heins. et Sylb.

[x] The Catholic Epistles were those, which were not confined to one country or city, but directed to the whole Church. Thus Œcumenius, on the first chapter of James—Καθολικαι λεγονται αὐται, οἱονει ἐγκυκλιοι· οὐ γαρ ἀφωρισμενως ἐθνει ἑνι, ἡ πολει, ὡς ὁ θειος Παυλος, οἱον Ῥωμαιοις ἡ Κορινθιοις, προσφωνεῖ παντας τας ἐπιστολας ὁ τῶν τοιουτων τοῦ Κυριοῦ μαθητων θιασος, ἀλλα καθολου τοῖς πιστοῖς, ἠτοι Ἰουδαιοῖς τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ, ὡς Πετρος, ἡ και πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπο την αὐτην πιστιν Χριστιανοις τελοῦσιν. Theo-

καθολικη ἐπιστολη [y]. For this Teacher occasionally occurs among the ancients, under the name Ἀποστολος; in this capacity, therefore, the Epistle belonged to the General Collection of the Apostles, or to the mixed writings.

Yet how (a respectable scholar objects) could the term καθολικος denote one class, since only two Epistles,—the first of Peter and John, are properly recognized? how could two writings be considered as a καθολικον συνταγμα? but the collection already existed, and according to Eusebius's repeated assertions, the whole of the other Epistles were in the Codex of the New Testament, and were (notwithstanding some might have continued to doubt them) publicly read in most Churches. Upon this my notion is founded (as this scholar seems himself afterwards to acknowledge) and certainly cannot subsist, except on this condition [z].

But in the 4th century [a] another signification was substituted for this. They continued to have more and more to do with Heretics, and henceforward principally opposed to them the already long established *locus communis* of an every where unanimous General Church, from which *they* were only renegades and factionists. They called the Church and doctrine, which were uniform throughout the world, την καθολικην.

doret and others depose to the same effect. These were otherwise called ἐγκυκλια γραμματα, or ἐγκυκλιοι ἐπιστολαι, *circular Epistles.*—*Translator.*

[y] Orig. contra Cels. L. i. n. 36.

[z] Pott. Epist. Cathol. Fascic. I. exhibens epistolam Jacobi. Prolegom. p. 26, 27. *The second edition.*

[a] It would be difficult to prove, that καθολικος was not accepted in this sense, before the fourth century: it every where refers to the General Orthodox Church, and the Catholic Epistles were those, which were addressed to it; the Catholic doctrines those, which it professed.—*Translator.*

This signification was now also given to the word, as that which was customary to a division of the Biblical books, and among the Catholic Epistles, it implied those, which being directed not to individual communities, but to the general Church, or to a great part of it, were probably circular letters, —which also accords with some of the Catholic. This is the elucidation of Theodoret, it was also accounted valid by the following commentators [b].

SECTION CXLV.

Before the 4th century, (in which for the first time an invariable agreement of all communities respecting the Canon was established), Christian literature with undisturbed freedom advocated, or controverted the authority of some writings of the New Testament. Particular teachers admitted or rejected certain writings according to the reasons before them. It is well known, that this took place, with several of the Catholic Epistles, besides the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, that it took place with that of James, the second and third of John, the second of Peter, and that of Jude.

They were indeed always circulated with the names of these authors, and by an established usage added to the other Biblical writings; but they were not holden in general in that estimation, which fell to the lot of these, because they were not, like them,

[b] Pott. Epist. Cathol. vol. i. Excurs. I. de voce Epist. Cath. p. 178. Schol. in Jac. Ep. edit. N. T. F. Matthæi. The Scholiast of the Parisian MSS. N. 705. προτετακται ἡ Ἰακωβοῦ ἐπιστολη τῶν ἀλλων ....ὁτι τῆς Πετρου καθολικωτερα, ταῖς γαρ ἀνα πᾶσαν την γην διεσπαρμεναις ἐγραφη δωδεκα φυλαις.

attested by vouchers and undoubted historical declarations, or because they had internal difficulties against them.

Eusebius describes the public opinion current respecting them, in a passage which we have already often adduced. It is in the 23rd chapter of the second book of his history: "The first of the Catholic Epistles, as they are called, viz. that of James, is also accounted unauthentic; for, few of the ancients either made mention of it, or of the Epistle of Jude, which is also one of the Catholic Epistles. It is however known, that in most communities, they ranked equally with the other Scriptures in the Church-service."

Usage and custom in very many Churches was therefore in favour of them, ἐν πλείσταις ἐκκλησιαις; but those, who required other grounds than usage and custom, were not prevented thereby, from thinking otherwise. They were not satisfied with the right of possession, they wished to inspect their title of descent, and demanded in their behalf the declarations of more ancient times and teachers. If these were wanting, they permitted themselves to have an opinion of their own, and took the liberty of doubting or rejecting them, according to their own critical discernment; others also were found, who concurred with them.

They felt, probably like ourselves, the want of historical vouchers, and drew a negative argument from the silence of antiquity, as it is also the case with us; but, as Eusebius represents the matter, they had not positive proofs from records to oppose to them. How could a place have been assigned to them only among the disputed books, if credible witnesses, who lived in the earlier days of Christianity, had unhesitatingly contradicted their supposed

Apostolic origin? or if others, having observed the time, at which they had afterwards become known, and the epoch of their subsequent appearance, had stated the place and persons, where and by whom they came into circulation?

We have therefore nothing to fear against them from this quarter. An established possession in many communities speaks rather in their favour, which was only from time to time partially attacked, where it was supported by fewer or by weaker documents.

Even this negative argument loses a great part of its force in some of our Catholic Epistles, when we consider their nature. Their brevity did not furnish the ancients with the multiplicity of ideas necessary for every species of compositions, nor such a number of arguments for their dogmatical and moral assertions, as the Epistles to the Romans, to the Corinthians, or any other more extensive work. And yet it was only on such occasions, that the ancient teachers could make use of them and attest their existence and authenticity. For not until in later times, when Christianity possessed a literature, did they begin to devote their labour to its literary history, to its authors and their works. The most ancient writings are admonitions of a moral tenor, apologies, or controversies, as the affairs of the time required and called them forth. Not until long afterwards were the Fathers at leisure to think of the history of religion, its fortunes and literary productions and the venerable men, who had deserved well of it. Circumstances and the necessity of polemical works had put them in possession of a history of the Heretics and the schools which branched from them, by Justin and Irenæus, ere Hegesippus, the first historian of the Christian Church was born. As there-

fore nobody had intentionally laboured upon the authors of remoter times, upon their works, upon those which were authentic and suspected, and upon their history,—so it depended upon chance, whether any one mentioned a more ancient writing in his compositions, and this chance was so much the less in favour of the smaller Epistles, in proportion as they were less in circulation and contents.

The negative argument was then usually enforced by internal reasons, or by those of higher criticism, which was often not badly exercised at Alexandria. This, however, cannot abridge our right of seeing and judging for ourselves ; with the critic personal considerations have no weight in such investigations.

The higher branch of criticism likewise stands open to us at all times, and I even entertain the hope of deriving from thence evident proofs in verification of some of these Epistles,—viz. in favor of that of James, of Jude, and the second of Peter.

This then is the place for adding the history of the two disputed Epistles of John; the cause, purport, and contents of which have already been before discussed.

SECTION CXLVI.

OF THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF JOHN.

For these I must *in limine* appeal to the possession and the established preference, which they had in many churches as their claims to be incorporated into the Codex of the New Testament. This precedes the testimonies, which we divide into Greek, Eastern and Western.

In the other half of the second century, Clemens of the Alexandrian school speaks of several Epistles of John, but so indeterminately, that we cannot discover how many of them he intended. For he refers to a passage in the first, 1 John, v. 16., and calls it the GREATER Epistle, whence we can only deduce, that this was not the only one, with which he was acquainted; but not whether he possessed one or two, which were smaller [c].

Origen, his successor in the ministry, affords to us a better solution of this particular.—"John," he says, "left behind him an Epistle containing very few stichi. It may be, that he left also a second and a third; for every one does not consider them authentic; however both only amount to a hundred stichi [d]."

Dionysius is the third teacher of this school, who likewise affords accounts respecting the Epistles of John. We have already seen, that he is acquainted with them all; but that he calls the two last only φερομενας, *suppositititious writings*. He was the first, who ascribed the Apocalypse to another John, a Presbyter of Ephesus, with whom Papias maintained an acquaintance. Others still farther extended this hypothesis, and ascribed also our Epistles to this Presbyter.

The Father of Church-history gives to us an intimation of this:—"The second and third Epistle of "John, whoever be the author, the Evangelist, or

[c] Φαινεται δε και Ἰωαννης ἐν τῃ μειζονι ἐπιστολῃ τας διαφορας τῶν ἁμαρτιων ἐκδιδασκων ἐν τουτοις· ἐαν τις ἰδῃ τον ἀδελφον· κ`.ρ`.λ`. L. ii. Strom. c 15

[d] Comm. in Matth. L. i. apud Euseb. H. E. vi. 25. καταλελοιπε δε και ἐπιστολην πανυ ὀλιγων στιχων· ἐστω δε, και δευτεραν και τριτην· ἐπει οὐ παντες φασι γνησιους εἰναι ταυτας. Πλην ουκ εισι στιχων ἀμφοτεραι ἑκατον.

"another of the same name, stand among the dis-
"puted writings [e]."

The Syrian Church had them in its oldest version, in which (as we have stated in its place) it not until a later period refused to them a situation. From it Ephræm became acquainted with them, and sometimes mentioned them, with the express name of their author [f].

Among the Westerns we have a very important avoucher for the second Epistle, who, on account of the place, where he resided in his youth, and the school, in which he was educated, deserves a peculiar regard, as a witness respecting the works of John. This is Irenæus, who refers to the second Epistle with the name of the author, and with a perfectly distinguishing predicate: "JOHN THE DISCIPLE OF THE LORD," ὁ τοῦ Κυριοῦ μαθητης. For thus he always calls the Evangelist in speaking of him and of his works [g].

He mentions him still in another place. After having there given extracts from the first Epistle, he writes, in the continuation of the treatise, "and John, the disciple of Jesus, in the before-mentioned Epistle, commanded, that they (the Heretics) should be shunned, saying, etc." But here he recites to us, word by word, the seventh and eighth verses of the second Epistle [h].

[e] τῶν ἀντιλεγομενων . . . . ἡ ὀνομαζομενη δευτερα και τριτη Ἰωαννοῦ· εἰτε τοῦ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχανουσαι, εἰτε ἑτερου ὁμωνυμου ἐκεινῳ. H. E. iii. 25.

[f] Hassencamp's Remark on the last Sections of the Introduction of Michaelis. p. 40—42.

[g] L. i. adv. Hær. c. 16. The passage is extant in Greek and Latin. Joannes enim Domini discipulus superextendit damnationem in eos, neque *ave* a nobis eis dici volens: qui enim dicit, inquit, *ave* . . . . . etc.

[h] L. iii. 16. n. 8. Et discipulus ejus Ioannes in *prædictâ Epistolâ* fugere eos præcepit, dicens; multi seductores exîerunt in hunc

Unless, in this instance, his memory has deceived him, he considered the second Epistle as an addition to the first, as a part of the *Epistola prædicta*, just as we have considered it to be a supplement, which was composed and dispatched at the same time with the first. Should this prove true, the following testimony will also obtain a different appearance.

The anonymous author of the fragments in Muratori, who is generally conceived to be Caius the Presbyter, mentions two Epistles of John in his list of the sacred books [i].

In the Carthaginian synod under Cyprian, Aurelius Bishop of Chullabi, gave his vote in the words of John, ii. Ep. 10. categorically referring to the Apostle of this name [k].

In the meanwhile there were also some in the Latin Church, who were inclined to assign the two smaller Epistles to that John, whom Dionysius had proposed as the author of the Apocalypse, like those whom we have before remarked among the Greeks, from whom this hypothesis was derived [l].

If now we collect into one sum our documentary proofs for their authenticity, authorities by far more numerous and more important in favour of the second Epistle than of the third arise on our side.

mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum in carne venisse. Hic est Seductor et Antichristus. Videte eos, ne perdatis, quod operati estis, &c.

[i] Epistola sanè Judæ, et superscripti Joannis duæ in Catholicâ habentur. Muratori. Antiq. Ital. Med. Æv. T. iii. p. 854.

[k] Opp. Cypr. Editio juxtà Baluz. Veneta. p. 711. Item alius Aurelius à Chullabi dixit: Joannes Apostolus in Epistolâ suâ posuit, dicens, si quis ad vos venit, et doctrinam Christi non habet, nolite eum admittere in domum vestram, et *ave* ne illi dixeritis, qui enim . . . . etc.

[l] Hieronym. in Catal. v. Joannes.

That of Irenæus seems even to decide its authenticity, as the third is not distinctly mentioned before the third century, up to which it was indeed transmitted under the name of John, but not with such testimonies, as gave general satisfaction [m].

SECTION CXLVII.

In the meantime both bear strongly presumptive internal criteria of their origin from the Apostle. We have already convinced ourselves, how harmoniously they coincide with the other works of John, how they agree with his condition and his personal circumstances, and how accurately the internal and unconstrained circumstantiality of these few lines every where applies to him. Nothing is here detached, nothing stands unconnected and isolated or even contradictory, as is the case with fictitious writings; nothing here is inconsistent with the intimations of antiquity—or mentioned merely indeterminately, and without particular reference, as is the case in authors, who adopt the person of another, without

[m] The disputed verse 1 John v. 7., is too inconsiderable a part of the New Testament to deserve an extensive discussion in an Introduction. Its examination belongs to a critical edition of the New Testament, which is answerable for all individual deviations from the text. The last defence of it is by W. F. Hetzel in the Biblical Investigator, Vol. ii., Part ii. Against which Horstig in Henke's Magazine for Religious Philosophy and Exegesis, Vol. ii., Part i. has raised some opposite arguments; but the chief writer is Griesbach in his remarks upon Hetzel's defence of the authenticity of the passage, 1 John v. 7. Giessen. 1794. 8. Griesbach appeared to me to have exhausted the subject; yet this question has recently been revived in England. As I am but superficially informed respecting these investigations, I am not qualified to decide on their merit.

being able to imagine themselves in his situation and circumstances. It is the contrary to all this, and throughout there is the most admirable circumstantial agreement with a remarkable situation in the life of the Apostle.

In them likewise prevails the simple unconstrained language, which we find in the first Epistle. The character is also the same; a benevolent heart open to all the purer feelings, but zealous, which discloses against the disturbers of peace a severity and a hostile vehemence, which was not attributed to the preacher of love; who however once wished to call fire from heaven, when his friend and master was offended.

This indignation increased, in proportion as the attempts of the deceivers, their presumption and the vexations in which they indulged themselves, became greater. The first and second Epistles contain warnings against them, their doctrines, and association with them, forcibly indeed but not vehemently; he dissuades the Deaconess, or whoever this benevolent woman may have been, who of her own accord superintended the friendly services of the Church, from hospitably receiving[n] and greeting such in the same manner as the brother in the faith was welcomed to the house, and entertained as a συγκοινωνος. But the third is more vehement, because it had arrived to a public breach of peace, to the dishonoring of the Apostle and his envoys; he threatens that *he would be mindful of the wrongs*, which he describes with sensibility and with a heart which was wounded by personality. Every thing, is exactly as the situation of the matter, the gradation of the offences, and their nearer reference to the author must have produced it. It is never-

[n] Cf. 2 John 10, 11. *Translator.*

theless no turbulent indignation, which overthrows his adversary with daring energy or bitter and passionate eloquence; neither is it even the resolute and severe earnestness of a Paul, who describes his enemies with keen outlines, and rebukes them into order with exuberant language. It is the indignation of a sensitive and affected heart, which rather pours forth complaints than raises accusations, and prosecutes them with energy, which has nevertheless sufficient power not to confine them patiently to itself.

It indeed cannot be denied, that there are not many of the ancients, who mention the second Epistle, and few of them, who mention the third; but the second is so very short, (especially if the expression, *ave ne dixeris*, which is rather striking than really vehement, had not so well pleased the Polemic,) that we should have possessed still fewer testimonies respecting it. The third, however, has yet this peculiarity, that it does not explain or recommend certain doctrines of faith, or principles of moral conduct, and consequently is no document for the general instruction of Christians, but it is rather a direction, relative to the private concerns of the Apostle. Therefore it did not offer to the ancients any assistance for instruction and refutation, a necessary consequence of which has been the want of testimonies respecting it, in their works.

SECTION CXLVIII.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

WHERE? in what country was this Epistle written? The natural objects, which surrounded

the author, the references to climate, which are evident in the Epistle, must conduct us to the answer of this question. The figurative part of the description, the images in which he embodies his ideas, pourtray to us the landscape and nature in which he collected conceptions, and in which his phantasy acquired its richness. The communication and the representation are not in the style of invention, but they proceed from the matter already prepared, and frequently without a clear consciousness of the author and against his will, betray the scenes and objects with which he is most familiar, and which he supposed the most popular and effectual to make his ideas perceptible to others, or to produce his own sensations in them. In this manner also the author freely discovers his fellow-countrymen without either intending it or wishing to conceal any thing.

His native land was situated not far from the sea, James i. 6., iii. 4., and was blessed with fertile productions, such as figs, oil, and wines, iii. 12°. These traces are, however, still rather general, and leave to us the choice of several countries of the ancient world. Thus also Sophocles (Œd. Colon. 16.) describes the district of Attica:

> χωρος δ' ὁδ' ἱερος, ὡς σαφ' εἰκασαι, βρυων
> δαφνης, ἐλαιας, ἀμπελου.....

Saline and bitter springs are well known to the author, iii. 11, 12. This is a somewhat nearer de-

° From the passages, which Hug has quoted, we are scarcely justified in arguing to St. James's actual residence, at the time when he composed this Epistle. They seem to be images drawn from the ancient Scriptures, and the common style of Jewish conversation, rather than observations suggested by any temporary residence. They doubtless apply very forcibly to Palestine, and are such as we might expect a native of the country to have used; but the application of them by no means renders it necessary, that the writer should have been, at that time, in Palestine.—*Translator.*

finition, which does not apply to very many countries, but in particular applies to Palestine, where they were very numerous, as Josephus observes in many passages, and all those travellers who have paid attention to the physical state of the country.

The country was formerly very much exposed to droughts, and from want of rain had often reason to apprehend sterility, v. 17, 18;—instantaneous destruction in the vegetable kingdom particularly was effected there by the ἀνεμος καυσων, or קדים, i. 11 [p]. We are more intimately acquainted with this wind, and the climate in which it prevails. The name, under which it here appears, is not only Western Asiatic, but Palestinian. Another phænomenon, which was present to the author's mind, decides in favour of the same locality; it is the early and latter rain, which commences at the sowing of the seed in March, on which the fertility of the year depends. He calls it, according to the technical language, יורה and [q] מלקוש, or πρωϊμος και ὀψιμος, v. 7., as it was called in Palestine.

[p] The introduction of this wind can determine nothing, as to the residence of St. James, much less can the name, which he has applied to it. Its prevalence over immense regions adjoining to Palestine, and over different parts of the East, generalizes it too much for Hug's purpose, and καυσων would equally be adapted to any name, which it might receive in the language of any country subjected to its pernicious influence.—*Translator.*

[q] Even this criterion is not so definite, as Hug would assume it to be. For both these rains, the first taking place towards the end of Marchesvan or October, the other in Nisan, or Abib, which is March, were as indispensable to the fertility of Egypt as of Palestine, consequently the same metaphor would be as natural to the inhabitant of the one country, as to the other. But independently of this consideration, it is evident that St. James, as a Jew writing ταῖς δωδεκα φυλαῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ would, wherever he was resident, adduce the national metaphors (if I may so style them):

From thence then he wrote to all the Jews dispersed in foreign countries and cities,—to the twelve tribes dispersed abroad, ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, i. 1.

SECTION CXLIX.

The Jewish nation, which were scattered about in the wide world, was divided into three principal divisions,—that in the mother-country, and the holy city, which was the central point of all union,—then into two Dispersions; the Dispersion of Asia, 1 Pet. i. 1., διασπορα Ἀσιας, and Babylon, its capital; and the διασπορα Ἑλληνων, John vii. 35., or the Greek Dispersion, which, on account of the language, seems to have considered Alexandria as the capital.

From the mother-country and the religious authorities in the Holy City, the commands and regulations for divine worship proceeded, *e. g.* on account of the intercalation, from which Easter, Pentecost, and the time of other festivals depended. From Jerusalem the decrees were sent forth to the Dispersion of Babylon, to that of Media, and to that of

which observation will apply with equal force to the other criteria adduced in this section. The idea contained in this verse was, with a slight variation, common in many parts of the East, and naturally would be common, wherever agriculture formed one of the chief employments of the people. Thus in Meidani's proverbs we find— آمن من الارض *more faithful than the earth*, احمل من الارض, *more fruitful* (or *prolific*) *than the earth*, on which this gloss exists, لانها تودي ما يودع, *because it restores that which is entrusted to it*. The verse, therefore, contained no allusion exclusively applicable to Palestine.—*Translator.*

Greece[r]. The Median captivity was that of the ten tribes, and was peculiarly disunited[s]; whence the commands from Jerusalem could only have concerned those individuals of the kingdom of Judea, who lived in various parts of this country. These probably were for the most part under the jurisdiction of Babylon.

The Babylonians had a chief, who was called ראש הגלות, or ריש גלותא, PRINCE OF THE EXILES. Among the Alexandrians he bore [t] the name of Ἀραβαρχης or Ἀλαβαρχης, respecting which much has been written [u].

The other Jewish authorities in foreign parts obtained their power for exercising their functions from the Head of the Διασπορα [x].

[r] Gemara Hierosolym. on Sanhedrim of the Mishnah cap. 1. constit. 2[da]: בני גלותא דבבל בני גלותא דמדי בני גלותא דיוון. Cf. Gem. Babyl. on the same passage in Mishnah.

[s] Liber Siphra upon Levit. xxvi. 38. Parasch. אם בחוקותי c. viii. sect. 1. אלא עשרה השבטים שגלו למדי.

[t] Inter quas ausus habere
Nescio quos titulos Ægyptius atque Arabarches, &c.
Juvenal, l. c.

Both in this passage and in that, in which the title occurs in Cicero, other Codices read ALABARCHES, and some ARABRACHES. The generally received reading Arabarches is suspicious, and seems either to have been an error of the copyist, or the modification of the Greeks: it could have had no reference to the Head of *the Jews* in Alexandria, and must have been limited to *the Arabs*, to whom it was not applied. Cujacius preferred Alabarches, and Hesychius interpreted *ἀλαβᾶ—μελαν, ᾧ γραφομεν*. To Hesychius, however, no attention is due: yet Alabarches is doubtless the correct term. It is probably compounded of אהל and אבות, formed into a Greek compound by the omission of the plural termination in אבות, and the substitution of *ἀρχης* for ראש, which may have been the first part of the Alexandrine title.—*Translator*.

[u] Joseph. Ant. L. xviii. c. 8., L. xx. c. 5., n. 2. c. 7. n. 3. Cicero Ep. ad Attic. L. ii. Ep. 17. Juvenal Sat. i. 130.

[x] Gemar. Babyl. in Tract. Sanhedr. c. 1. § 1.: וכן אמר שמואל לשקול רשותא מבית ריש גלותא:

In this arrangement, by which the maintenance of the religious union of the whole Jewish Nation was attained, each presidency as we see, had an appointed province. But the commands and letters of authority to all of them could only be issued from Jerusalem, the central point of the religious Power.

The Epistle of James is one of this description, directed to all the tribes, wherever they might be dispersed; it should therefore have been written from the Holy City, by the Head of the school at Jerusalem.

SECTION CL.

What now induced the author to this undertaking? What occasion, what necessities required him to write it? The Epistle (let me for a time be allowed to use this harsh expression) so very much contradicts the Apostle Paul, that it has the appearance of being composed against some of his doctrinal principles and assertions. All that Paul has taught respecting Faith, its efficacy for justification, and the unprofitableness of works, is here directly denied. It is not impossible, that these two writers, by mere chance, may have entered on the same subject, and made assertions opposed to each other, on this proposition, without the one being aware of the other's writings, or intentionally exciting a controversy against him.

Is then mere chance evident in this? or is the opposition so evident in the minutiæ, that we must cease to attribute it to the mutual effect of accident?

Paul has declared his opinion upon this subject most circumstantially in the Epistle to the Romans

and in that to the Hebrews; but in James such peculiar references to both Epistles are manifest, as are not produced by chance. Several ideas, even the language in which they are clothed, the expression and the metaphorical turn were transferred by him from the Epistle to the Romans. James says, at the beginning, i. 3. γινωσκοντες, ὁτι το δοκιμιον ἡμῶν τῆς πιστεως κατεργαζεται ὑπομονην. This idea Paul also states, εἰδοτες, ὁτι ἡ θλιψις ὑπομονην κατεργαζεται, ἡ δε ὑπομονη δοκιμην, Rom. v. 3.; the difference only exists in γινωσκοντες and εἰδοτες, each of which is a participle; and in the change of δοκιμη and δοκιμιον. James pourtrays the incentive to evil by the image of war, which is produced by the lusts in our members, iv. 1. ἐκ τῶν ἡδονων ὑμῶν, τῶν στρατευομενων ἐν τοῖς μελεσιν ὑμῶν. The idea and the image is also in Rom. vii.23. νομον ἐν τοῖς μελεσι μοῦ ἀντιστρατευομενον τῷ νομῳ τοῦ νοος μοῦ. Of the same nature on both sides are the passages in James iv. 4. ὁτι ἡ φιλια τοῦ κοσμου ἐχθρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, and in Rom. viii. 7. διοτι το φρονημα τῆς σαρκος ἐχθρα εἰς Θεον. The rash judgment of others is disapproved by both in the same rhetorical figure and the same expressions, James iv. 12., συ τις εἰ, ὁς κρινεις τον ἑτερον; Rom. xiv. 4., συ τις εἰ, ὁ κρινων ἀλλοτριον οἰκετην, and then follows also a similar clause adjoined to it, εἰς γαρ . . . . . ὁ δυναμενος σωσαι—δυνατος γαρ ἐστιν ὁ Θεος στῆσαι.

This intentional opposition becomes still more evident in the detail of the question respecting Works and Faith. Paul defends the pre-eminence of Faith by the example of Abraham, Rom. iv. 1.; Heb. xi. 8. But James maintains from the same example the superiority of works, James ii. 21. Paul adduces as a proof in favour of his position the justification of Rahab the harlot. Heb. ii. 31. But James proves the contrary from the justification of Rahab, ii. 25.

They are therefore not only opposed to each other in opinions, but the latter employs himself in contradicting the individual proofs. Though in the life of Abraham, both sought a support for totally different assertions, this cannot well appear strange to any one; for the ancestor of the whole nation, and the first depositary of the promises was an illustrious example of the guidance of God, to which the most different writers might easily have been led, without a concerted plan or agreement, or Polemical intention, in opposition to each other; but that they, in a person so inconsiderable and so little to be commended as the [y] harlot, should so unanimously have sought proofs and examples for their opposite opinions, cannot be explained from the possibility of the pre-eminence and universal interest of the subject having drawn the attention of all to it, as a very respectable scholar has observed [z].

[y] Although the Septuagint and James have both used the word πορνη, it has been disputed, whether or not Rahab was a harlot. From the testimonies of Herodotus and Diodorus Siculus, it has been argued, that houses of refreshment, manzils, &c. were kept by women in Ægypt, and that the same custom also prevailed in Canaan among the other members of the Family of Ham. This assertion appears to be well substantiated:—it is also supported by the deduction of πορνη from περναω, whence some have conceived, that the LXX. also intended to express a tavern-keeper.

That the person, into whose house the spies entered, was a tavern keeper, appears the most probable, and it derives no small authority from the Targum, which interprets—זונה אתתא פונדקיתא *mulier cauponaria*. Nor is the hypothesis of those, who from the general bad characters of these *cauponariæ* suppose the term זונה to have been applied to them without restriction, totally devoid of weight. Suffice it to say, that Rabbi David Kimchi notices this interpretation, in the instance of Rahab, which is of no small importance, as her name enters into the genealogy of Matthew.—*Translator.*

[z] Storr Dissertat. de Epistol. Cathol. Occasione et Consilio. Tübing. 1789. Sect. v.

But the example of Abraham has also this peculiarity—that each has derived his proof in favour of his position from the same event in his life, and from the same Biblical passage; and that both for this purpose use almost the same expressions in the representation, Rom. iv. 2. τι ἐροῦμεν Ἀβρααμ τον πατερα ἡμῶν εὑρηκεναι . . . . . εἰ γαρ Ἀβρααμ ἐξ ἐργων ἐδικαιωθη: James ii. 21. Ἀβρααμ ὁ πατηρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἐργων ἐδικαιωθη—then on both sides they appeal to the passage in Genesis xv. 6. ἐπιστευσε Ἀβρααμ τῷ Θεῷ, και ἐλογισθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσυνην. James ii. 23.; Rom. iv. 3. Paul quotes, τι ἡ γραφη λεγει—James, on the contrary, thus ends, και ἐπληρωθη ἡ γραφη λεγουσα.

Likewise the other example respecting Rahab, from which Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xi. 31. defends the value of faith, has in the short excursus of the two writers more than a casual similarity. The former mentions her by the predicate, ἡ πορνη; so likewise the latter Ῥααβ ἡ πορνη, James ii. 25.: Paul says δεξαμενη κατασκοπους, and James with the same word and participle ὑποδεξαμενη ἀγγελους.

The opposition, therefore, does not take place merely in the principal question, but in the individual proofs and in the detail of them, with references to words. If they could casually thus coincide one against the other in the principal question, yet they could not thus harmonize in opposite assertions, by mere chance, in one and the same argument; for, the contradiction in the matter does not lead to the same proofs. Neither could they become, by accident, so similar in the discussion and investment of their proofs.

The Epistle was therefore written intentionally against Paul and against the doctrine, that faith effects justification and Divine grace in man. The

first of these compositions, in which Paul spoke so much in favour of faith, was principally intended for the Jews, who were members of the Roman Church. We may be sure that it did not long remain confined to this district. The constant departure and arrival of foreigners in the capital of the world, the participation which the events of Christianity found among its professors, the interest, which Jewish converts and the converts from Heathenism must have had in this Epistle, which spoke such strong truths and maintained such peculiar things; all this must necessarily have soon circulated the Epistle to the Romans from the central point of the Empire over the rest of the world.

This extollation, this recommendation of Faith, and depreciation of Works, were even at that time capable of all those misinterpretations, which subsequently arose from thence, and which have been so vehemently defended among us; but at that time, when Christianity was forming itself, and establishing its doctrinal system, this might have given a tendency to it, which might have defeated its whole object. The Epistle to the Romans had, during four years, time enough to be read and misinterpreted, and to have caused unwished for notions to be adopted, until that to the Hebrews appeared, which favoured and more extensively recommended the same opinions.

The Epistle to the Hebrews was directed to Palestine, consequently to the very same country in which the author of the Epistle of James was brought up, educated, and lived. He was therefore soon able to see the impression, which it made, the perverted judgments, which it produced, and the disadvantages which practical, and active Christianity, the religion of works, had to experience from it. It is therefore conceivable, why some one in this place

arose, enjoining his brethren in a treatise, not to suffer themselves to be misled, and to have constantly before their eyes the principles of Christian conduct.

SECTION CLI.

Who then is the composer? He calls himself James; but the Bible recognizes two or three of that name, who, by means of their dignity and vocation were qualified and invested with authority to instruct the world.

There is one James, the son of Zebedee, Matt. iv. 21.; Mark iii. 17.; Luke vi. 14.; Acts i. 13. But he died long before under Agrippa the elder, when Paul first commenced his career, Acts xii. 2. He cannot therefore be the person in question.

Besides him there is another James, the son of [a] Al-

[a] Bertholdt supposes, that there were two of the name of Mary, besides the Magdalene, that one was the mother of James, Joses, Simon, and John, the sister of the Virgin Mary, and wife of Alphæus or Cleopas, who appears to be one and the same individual. There is vast ingenuity in his conjecture. "Κλῶπας and Ἀλφαῖος are only two different ways of writing in Greek a single Hebrew name, which written merely with the consonants is חלפי and may be pronounced in two ways, either as חַלַפַּי which yields the Greek Κλῶπας, or חַלְפַּי, which is Ἀλφαῖος. For, the Greeks cannot perfectly pronounce the ח, and express it softly either by α or η, *e. g.* for מֵרֵחֵם they say Μερεημ, for חֵוִי εὐαῖος, Gen. x. 17.; for חֲמָתִי ἀμαθι, Gen. x. 18. Sometimes, however, they substitute a κ for it, *e. g.* Καρρα for חָרָן—Φασεκ for פָּסַח, 2 Chron. xxx. 1.—Ταβεκ for טֶבַח Gen. xxii. 24."

As we may expect, fabulists have indulged on this subject; some, among whom is Jerome, conjecture that Joseph had a former wife, by whom he had the Brothers of Jesus, and that Cleopas and

phæus, Matth. x. 3., xxvii. 56.; Mark iii. 18., xv. 40.; Luke vi. 15.; Acts i. 13.—Also, a James, who occurs in Matth. xiii. 55.; Mark vi. 3.; Galat. i. 19.; and who is called the Brother of the Lord.

Many distinguish the Brother of the Lord from James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle [b]. We must investigate the author of the Epistle, and enquire respecting every James, who appears in the *Bible* invested with the dignity and office of the ministry.

James the Brother of the Lord and James the son

Joseph were brothers. Hence, Theophylact says on Gal. i. 19. Κλωπας και Ἰωσηφ ἀδελφοι· τοῦ Κλωπα ἀπαιδος τελευτησαντος, ὁ Ἰωσηφ ἐξανεστησεν αὐτῷ σπερμα, και ἐτεκε τοῦτον (*scil. Jacobum*) και τους ἀλλους ἀδελφους αὐτοῦ, και Μαριαμ, ἡν τοῦ Κλωπα οὐσαν, ἀδελφην τῆς τοῦ Κυριοῦ μητρος το εὐαγγελιον εἰπε. In another place, he says, that Joseph had four sons by her and two daughters, viz. Mary and Salome. But, Origen in Catenâ in John Ch. 2. and Epiphanius, Hær. lxxviii. maintain, that Joseph had a former wife. In the Epistle of the Pseudo-Ignatius, of which the Greek is wanting, we read, "similiter filium venerabilem Jacobum, qui cognominatur Justus, quem referunt Christo Jesû simillimum facie, vitâ, et modo conversationis, ac si ejusdem uteri frater esset gemellus."

James the son of Zebedee was the brother of John, but James the son of Alphæus or Cleopas we conclude to be the same, who is elsewhere called the Brother of our Lord; and as the former was slain by Herod, (Acts xii. 2.), we do not hesitate in ascribing the Epistle to the latter.—*Translator.*

[b] The dispute respecting each James is of very ancient date. The opinion and arguments of those who admitted, besides James the son of Zebedee, two others, the Disciple and the Brother of the Lord, are discussed at large by Pott, Epistolæ Cath. Perp. Annot. Illustratæ. Vol. i., Prol. P. 1—23. That which is opposed to it is in the Academical essay: De Jacobo epistolæ eidem adscriptæ auctore. Scripsit Gabler. Altdorf. 1787. Cf. Eichhorn's General Library of Biblical Literature, Vol. i. Pt. vi. p. 1011. The book entitled, The Epistles of two Brothers of Jesus in our Canon, Lemgo 1775, distinguishes two persons, but accepts James, the Brother of Jesus, as his own Brother. Upon the whole I coincide with the opinion of Dr. Gabler. Much is to be found upon this subject in Michaelis, Introd. to N. T. 4th edition, Pt. ii. § 238—241.

of Alphæus, the Apostle, are, in my opinion, for the following reasons, but one and the same person.

The Brothers of the Lord are James, Joses, Simon, and Judas, Matth. xiii. 55. In the catalogues of the Apostles, besides James the son of Zebedee, these similar names again occur, *e.g.* a James, a Simon, a Judas, Luke vi. 15.; Acts i. 13.; Matth. x. 3.

If we consult Mark, similar circumstances are also attached to the similar names. Matthew has arranged the Apostles in the following order: James, Judas, Simon, x. 3, 4.; but the Brothers of Jesus in another, namely; James, Simon, Judas, xiii. 55. Mark, not satisfied with this arrangement, made an alteration, and arranged the Brothers of Jesus exactly in the same manner as the Apostles of this name are placed in their succession, namely, James, Judas, Simon, Mark iii. 18.; vi. 3.; as if he wished to cause not merely the similarity of their names, but likewise an actual similarity of arrangement or relation to be recognized between them.

The name of the Father of the three Apostles and the Brother of the Lord is so similar, that our assertion becomes more probable from it. The Apostles are the sons of Alphæus, and the Brothers of Jesus are sons of Clopas.

That *Mary*, whom Matthew calls *the Mother of the Brothers of Jesus*, xxvii. 56. John, in the parallel place, calls *Mary the wife of Clopas*, xix. 25. There was besides no other Mary, except the Magdalene, at the passion and death. Matthew excludes any third, and recognizes, besides the Magdalene, only the *other* Mary, xxvii. 61., xxviii. 1. Μαρια ἡ Μαγδαληνη, και ἡ ἀλλη Μαρια. John could therefore only have understood by Mary the wife of Clopas, the Mother of the Brothers of Jesus, and Mary the wife of Alphæus and Mary the wife of Clopas is one person.

For, חלפי is pronounced according to the Galilæan dialect—ܟܠܦܐ—Κλῶπα, and is rendered, according to the Greek inflection, Ἀλφαῖος, as חגי is rendered Ἀγγαῖος [c]. That, which the collation of the Evangelists had before furnished respecting the Father and Mother of these three men, is here confirmed by the analogy of the language; and the sons of Clopas and the sons of Alphæus are in reality not different persons.

Against this identity only a single objection, which is of any moment, contends. For the Brothers of Jesus did not believe in him, as John assures us, vii. 5. οὐδε γαρ οἱ ἀδελφοι αὐτοῦ ἐπιστευον εἰς αὐτον. How could then these Unbelievers have been received among the Apostles?

But, besides that to believe in Jesus has a very extensive signification in John, and will mean no less than to acknowledge him as the Son of God and the Messiah, about which they might still have hesitated without refusing to him credence, as to his doctrines and his qualifications as a prophet,—it is also well known, that James, Simon, Judas, are actually the last in the list of the Apostles, and have only Iscariot himself after them. Consequently so much the more might the three Apostles have been the same men as the three Brothers of Jesus of the same name, who advanced so slowly in the faith.

If we now farther follow those of the name of James, where they appear in their ministerial office after the death of the Lord, the Bible continually im-

[c] The word Κλεοπας, Luke xxiv. 18., is not here to be taken into the consideration: this is, as Dr. Gabler has well observed, a Greek name from Κλεοπατρος, formed like Ἀντιπας from Ἀντιπατρος, Ἀρποκρας from Ἀρποκρατης. His wife was not present at this event; he only says in general terms, γυναικες τινες, v. 22., without stating a nearer participation of himself or his family in this fact.

plies, that there still was another James, besides the son of Zebedee, who was decapitated.

Not long after his decapitation, (Acts xii. 2.), when Peter was liberated from prison, (where a similar or a still more cruel end awaited him) and quitted Jerusalem by night, he commanded them to communicate the event to James and to the other Brethren, Acts xii. 17. He speaks as though there were still a single James remaining ; he uses no predicate or mark of distinction, as if there could be no mistake whatever in the person. We know from another narrative, that this James was the Brother of the Lord, Gal. i. 19.

Paul and Barnabas (Acts xv. 13,) made enquiries respecting the legal obligations at the assembly of the Apostles at Jerusalem. When they were silent, JAMES *answered* and spoke — and decided. This incident is again so represented, as though there were but one of this name, and as though there could be no mistake as to the person.

When Paul subsequently reappeared at Jerusalem, (Acts xxi. 18.), he introduced his companions to the house of James, on the day after his arrival ; in his house also the whole Presbytery had assembled. Among those, who were conducted here, was also our author, (εἰσηει ὁ Παυλος συν ἡμῖν προς Ἰακωβον) who speaks in this place, and throughout the Acts of the Apostles, as if this was the only James, who was invested with power and doctrinal authority, who required no further distinction to be recognized.

In the same manner also Paul acts, when he relates in the Epistle to the Galatians some of the circumstances of his life after his conversion.

When he for the first time after his conversion came to Jerusalem, he conversed for a few days with Peter ; but no other of the Apostles (he con-

tinues) did I see, except James the Brother of the Lord, i. 19[d]. In this instance he added to this James a predicate, because the other—the son of Zebedee and Brother of John—was, at the time of which he is speaking, still alive, (Cf. Acts, Sect. 71.) and consequently a mistake might have been occasioned.

He died soon afterwards, and henceforward but one James is mentioned. Peter escaped from the Holy City, and, as it seems, went to Antioch. There he ate with the Gentiles, until some came from James, προ γαρ ἐλθειν τινας ἀπο Ἰακωβου.

At the second mission, James was at Jerusalem, without any mark of distinction, a fundamental pillar of the school, with Peter and John, Gal. ii. 9., and indeed the chief among them.

As we have now, for the first time, become acquainted with this individual James as the Brother of the Lord, according to the assertion of Paul, and found him always present at Jerusalem, in the same manner we also find him there again at the last, and avouched by historical records to be the Brother of

[d] ἑτερον δε τῶν Ἀποστολων οὐκ εἰδον, εἰ μη Ἰακωβον τον ἀδελφον τοῦ Κυριου. This passage places the Brother of the Lord among the Apostles; there remains, therefore, no longer any reason for making a distinction between the Apostle and the Brother of the Lord of the same name. But those, who amuse themselves with many of the name of James, oppose to us the possibility of another explanation. They think that it might also be understood; I saw no other Apostle, *but only James* the Brother of the Lord. But in this case the sentence would be very indistinctly expressed, and ἀλλα μονον should have been used instead of εἰ μη, as Paul frequently has done. According to Paul's customary language, εἰ μη, if it follows a general position, expresses an exception, 1 Cor. ii. 11., οὐδεις εἰδεν—εἰ μη το πνευμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, 1 Cor. viii. 4. ὁτι οὐδεις Θεος, εἰ μη εἱς, 2 Cor. xii. 5., ὑπερ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ καυχησομαι—εἰ μη ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενειαῖς μου. Consequently the passage means: I saw no other of the Apostles, but James the Brother of the Lord: and it is not to be accepted exclusively, but as an exception.

the Lord. Hegesippus says of this James, the Brother of the Lord, that he was the Head of the Church at Jerusalem, and celebrated under the cognomen of Justus [e]. Clemens, in the sixth book of the Ὑποτυπώσεις, confirms both; according to the declaration of Jerome, he is even said, about thirty years, to have superintended the Church in the Holy City [f].

SECTION CLII.

But who, under the supposition of more than one James, is the author of the Epistle? That James, who was the Head of the Church at Jerusalem, (even if we would admit another James besides him, unknown and not celebrated for his actions) was the only one, who could assure himself, that his name would be acknowledged and his authority respected over all the earth, wherever the Jews might be scattered.

He was also the only person, who, by virtue of his vocation, which he himself discharged as chief of the community in the Holy City, possessed an established right of deciding, as Œcumenic Teacher to all the Judaic Christians of the world. He was invested, among the Christian Jews, with that privilege, which was conceded to the religious Superintendent at Jerusalem, of exercising a superintendence over all the Dispersions and the highest religious power, which no other Teacher besides could assume. The chief of the Asiatic Dispersion might watch over his

[e] Euseb. H. E. ii. 23.
[f] Euseb. H. E. ii. 1. Hieronym. Catal. voc. Jacobus.

provinces, over the Διασπορα Ασιας; and the chief of the Africano-Europæan over the Διασπορα των Ελλήνων, over the Hellenistic Jews; but neither of them might presume to issue Epistles and commands to all the twelve tribes, to the collective body of the Jews. From the central point alone, where all the tribes and individuals continually met, commands and instructions for all could be issued.

This established organization of Judaism would have rendered the attempt of any person, who could not avail himself of their ordinary notions, and who could not claim respect and general obedience as the Principal at Jerusalem, almost incapable of a general effect, even among the Jewish Christians. But among all bearing this name, this could only have succeeded, and been granted to James the Brother of the Lord, who was resident at Jerusalem.

It was also not the Apostle, if the Brother of the Lord and himself were different persons. For he does not call himself Αποστολος; yet he should have so called himself, for the sake of justifying his ministerial authority; for one inferior to him could not have thought of giving decisions respecting the doctrinal system to the whole community of the Jewish Christians.

It was the Brother of the Lord. This was the distinguishing appellation, under which one James was raised above the Apostles, and was the chief pillar at Jerusalem. He could indeed by no means have assigned that name to himself; for the Lord was never Brother to a mortal man. Exalted above all, he had already assumed the government of the world; and, ἀδελφος Κυριου now signified Αδελφοθεος and Θεαδελφος, which was a degree of arrogant presumption, which James could not have allowed

to himself. Therefore, there merely remained to him the choice of affixing the predicate of *servant* in the place of that of BROTHER, and of calling himself δουλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as the author of the Epistle did.

SECTION CLIII.

AMONG several moral compositions, which are written with a like reference to the same truths and assertions, there will always exist a striking difference, which depends upon the mind of the author and its particular direction. The same divine truth finds a different reception in the minds of different men, and is more comprehended on one side or the other, is felt more faintly or more energetically, approximates itself more to these or those notions, which we have adopted, unites itself with them, and naturalizes itself in a different manner in the human understanding.

Our Epistle, simply considered with respect to the sentiments, independently of metaphors, expressions and representations, has a peculiar character. It has the forbearance and lenity and the peculiar bent of mind of James of Jerusalem, the Brother of the Lord, as it is described by history.

James of Jerusalem treated the Jews with particular moderation with respect to the obligation of the Law and its observances. At the assembly of the Apostles he indeed pronounced the Gentiles free from the observances of Judaism; but he has not, by a single word, contradicted their obligatory force on the Jews. From this they might learn how much of their religion was necessary in Christianity: whether they were inclined to it or not, they were any thing

but offended, Acts xv. 13—22[s]. He even connived at their adherence, for a time, to the distinction of meats, Gal. ii. 12, 13., and at their opinions of the legal defilements. Thus he indirectly shows the superfluousness of the Law; nevertheless he permitted this oscillation for the present, as many could not or would not do without it.

In a writing like this, which insists upon practical Christianity, upon the doctrines of Jesus, as the highest moral Law, we would suppose, that he would have been obliged, without reservation, to declare, that the Law of Moses was no longer the rule of human actions, and that the customs of Judaism have no longer the value of religious works. But the author of the Epistle acts quite differently; he leaves the favourite opinions of the Jews unassailed, and merely continues to annex to them something better and more perfect, hoping that this will of itself supplant the old Law. He fully admits the Law of Moses to have been a rule of human actions, and of that which was permitted to them for the time, (James ii. 8. and

[s] The reference was to the pollutions interdicted by the Mosaic Law: *dλισγημα*, which no where occurs in pure Greek, Hesychius interprets *μεταληψις των μιαρων θυσιων*, with whom Suidas and Alberti's glossary accord. I cannot but think, with Jurieux, that this decision contains some allusion to the Noëtic precepts, and that *πορνεια* refers to the prostitution practised in many Pagan Temples, such as that of Venus Mylitta. Maresius conceived the injunction to relate to taverns, where meats offered to idols were sold; but this is unsubstantiated, and only founded on זונה, according to the Targum, meaning a tavern-keeper and a harlot. Cf. Σοφ. Σαλ. xiv. 26. Michaelis connected it with the offerings to idols, and retracing the word to *περναω* or *περνημι*, understood it *quasi πορνειας σαρκος*. In this he is abetted by Suidas, who explains *πορνεια* by *εἰδωλολατρεια*. Cf. Heinsii Exer. Sacr. p. 303. Be this as it may, it passed into an Ecclesiastical Law: whence we read in the Apostolic Canon *νε—ει τις επισκοπος, ἡ πρεσβυτερος, ἡ διακονος, ἡ ὁλως του καταλογου του ιερατικου φαγῃ κρεας ἐν αἱματι ψυχῆς αὐτου, ἡ θηριαλωτον, ἡ θνησιμαῖον, καθαρειαθω· τουτο γαρ και ὁ νομος ἀπειπεν.*—*Translator.*

11.) and then only maintains, that the New Code requires all this in a far higher degree, ii. 12.; he allows it to have been an institution of Divine authority, as far as it availed, iv. 11.; but he recommends the Christian as the more perfect and more exalted, i. 25. The ceremonial religion of the Jews, Θρησκειαι, even if it be occupied in unimportant exercises, gives him no offence; he leaves it as it is, and only certifies us, that the purest religious feeling consists in works of internal morality, i. 26. 27. Do we not in this recognize the James of Jerusalem?

History[h] describes the Brother of the Lord as a man of extraordinary austerity in life and principles, on account of which he obtained the distinguished epithet of "RIGHTEOUS,"—he was, as it were, the Cato among the disciples of Jesus. This relentless rigour, which, not satisfied with individual perfections in a virtuous man, demands the fulfilment of the whole moral Law, and requires the whole circle of virtues, without acknowledging any which are solitary, is forcibly expressed in the Epistle, ii. 10. He is no where inclined to pardon any thing in morality, even in the most inferior requisitions, and to distinguish the great from the small.

According to History he was a very peculiar reverer of prayer[i], and had the warmest convictions of its benefit and efficacy. In this respect also our Epistle is strongly distinguished, and little as he is to be charged with prolixity, he nevertheless frequently repeats his words for the sake of impressively recommending prayer, i. 5—9.; iv. 2, 3.; v. 16—19.

The Epistle, therefore, is none of those ideal images, which are sketched in general traits, indeterminate and without character; but it is the transcript of an

[h] Hegesipp. apud Euseb. H. E. L. ii. c. 23.
[i] Hegesippus, loc. cit.

individual; it expresses a mind and a mode of thinking—it is no fiction—but the portrait of a human mind with every accuracy of lineament, from whence we argue to a real existence.

There is an historical character contained in it: and indeed the character of James, who superintended the ministry at Jerusalem, and who was called the Brother of the Lord. We therefore not only perceive from hence, that the Epistle is a genuine work of a certain James in the first age of Christianity; but we likewise recognize him, to whom among the many of the same name, if such existed, it belongs.

SECTION CLIV.

The order now leads us also to the testimonials of the ancients, and to the accounts, which *exist in* favor of its authenticity, and which enable us to represent its history.

The notion respecting faith and works, which was founded on the writings of Paul, would certainly have become the general theory, if some important teacher had not corrected it; but we rather find, that the opinion of James was taught, as harmonized with that of Paul. Consequently the influence of this writing upon the most ancient doctrinal system cannot be mistaken, whence it obtains a very brilliant testimony in favor of its authenticity, and of the legislative authority of its author.

The doctrine of works and faith is discussed by Clemens Romanus in the first Epistle to the Church at Corinth. He does not indeed mention James by name, for the ancients of that epoch seldom made use of the Apostolic writings with a nominal reference; but it is manifestly the doctrine of James,

which he delivers, and that indeed with striking approximations to the individual positions and proofs, and also with strong reminiscences with regard to the expression.

He speaks, c. 38. of the real wisdom, which is made known by deeds and works, nearly as James speaks, iii. 13. ὁ σοφος ἐνδεικνυσθω την σοφιαν αὐτοῦ, μη ἐν λογοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐργοις ἀγαθοις.

In the 30th chapter he begins like James, iv. 6. ὁ γαρ Θεος ὑπερηφανοις ἀντιτασσεται, and after some sentences passes on to καταλαλια, as James, iv. 11. to καταλαλεων, and at the end, he explains its design, as to justification, ἐργοις δικαιοῦμενοι και μη λογοις, to be by means of active Christianity. Θεος γαρ ὑπερηφανοις ἀντιτασσεται, ταπεινοις δε διδωσι χαριν. Κολληθωμεν οὐν ἐκεινοις, οἰς ἡ χαρις ἀπο τοῦ Θεοῦ δεδοται . . . . . ἐγκρατευομενοι ἀπο παντος ψιθυρισμου και καταλαλιας πορρω ἑαυτους ποιουντες, ἐργοις δικαιοῦμενοι και μη λογοις.

He does not treat the example of Abraham and Rahab, like Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews, to which he often plainly and verbally refers; but he follows the steps of James. He says, c. 10, Ἀβρααμ ὁ φιλος προσαγορευθεις; so is he called only in the Epistle of James, πιστος εὑρεθη ἐν τῳ ὑπηκοον γενεσθαι τοῖς ῥημασι Θεοῦ, James ii. 23. After a while he continues; ἐπιστευσε Ἀβρααμ τῳ Θεῳ, και ἐλογισθη αὐτῳ εἰς δικαιοσυνην.—Moreover he adduces the offering of Abraham, like James, ii. 21., as a proof, that he united works with Faith; δια πιστιν—και δι' ὑπακοης προσηνεγκεν αὐτοῦ (τον υἱον) θυσιαν τῳ Θεῳ.

In the same manner he says of Rahab, that she was saved for having united works with faith, for having received and saved the spies of Joshua: δια πιστιν και φιλοξενιαν ἐσωθη Ῥααβ ἡ πορνη'—εἰσδεξαμενη αὐτοῦς ἐκρυψε, εἰς το ὑπερῳον. . . . . και ἐξηγαγε αὐτοῦς.

In Irenæus also a passage is quoted respecting Abraham's justification, which, as it there stands, is likewise found in James word for word and no where else: quòd Abraham sine circumcisione et sine observantiâ Sabbatorum *credidit Deo et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et Amicus Dei vocatus est*, L. adv. Hær. iv. c. 16.; James ii. 23. As the Father of the Church has shortly before, (c. iv. 8.,) cited very accurately the corresponding passage from Paul, (Rom. iv. 3.) we plainly perceive, that it was not simply a particular reading in his MS. of the Epistle to the Romans; and as it also no where appears thus in the Old Testament, we can only regard it as a recollection from the Epistle of James, though he has not mentioned the name of the author.

Early, however, as this Epistle may have been known to the Latins, it was nevertheless not quoted by name, in the works of the Latin fathers still extant, until the fourth century. Jerome even tells us, that it was accounted to be the work of another author, and that only, in course of time, *Paullatim tempore procedente*, it acquired regard and credibility [k]. It is probable, that the Synod of Carthage had some share in the better reception, which this Epistle subsequently found among the Latins.

But it is remarkable, that in the East, where, necessarily, there must have been a particular acquaintance with this treatise, it was also esteemed. Syria, where better information respecting a writing published in Palestine might be obtained than elsewhere, possessed the Epistle in its oldest Ecclesiastical version, and amidst all the disputed Catholic Epistles, which it subsequently rejected, it invariably preserved that of James.

[k] Hieronym. Catal. v. Jacobus.

Ephræm made use of it in many places, but most evidently in the Greek writings, and ascribed it to James the Brother of the Lord. Other Syriac authors after him made use of it as of the other sacred books, sometimes also even with the name of the author. Their testimonies a deceased scholar has diligently and judiciously collected and compiled [l].

In the same manner as the Syrian Church had three Catholic Epistles, that of James, the 1st of Peter and John, so also had some countries of Asia Minor. Whether the well-known Iambics, which attest it, be by Gregory Nazianzen, or by Amphilochius of Iconium, the value of the testimony is still the same [m].

The African Church furnishes us with no such favourable depositions respecting this document, as the Eastern and Western have given to us. Until the third century we find only very conjectural references to this composition in the Greek teachers, which are by no means marked with sufficient perspicuity to be considered as identical passages. One passage, however, in Clemens Alexandrinus is distinguishably remarkable ἐαν μη—συν τῳ μετα τῆς ἐν τουτοις τελειωσεως και τῳ τον πλησιον ἀγαπᾷν, και εὐεργετειν δυνασθαι, οὐκ ἐσεσθε βασιλικοι [n]. Cf. James, ii. 8. Origen is the first, who mentions this Epistle distinctly and expressly, and from his declaration it

[l] Ephræm Opp. Græc. T. iii. p. 51. Ἰακωβος δε ὁ τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἀδελφος λεγει, πενθησατε, και κλαυσατε. κ. τ. λ. Cf. L. i. p. 18. Hassencamp's observations on the last sections of the Introduction of Michaelis, p. 27—31.

[m] Καθολικων Ἐπιστολων τινες μεν ἑπτα φασιν· οἱ δε τρεις μονας χρῆναι δεχεσθαι,—την Ἰακωβου μιαν, μιαν δε Πετρου, την τε Ἰωαννου μιαν. Opp. Gregor. Naz. T. ii. p. 195.

[n] Strom. L. vi. p. 825. Edit. Venet.

may be inferred, that in the third century the Epistle was circulated far, and had already been quoted for a long time under the name of James; but that the opinions were divided, as to its authenticity or spuriousness [o]. After him Dionysius Alexandrinus makes mention of the Epistle, and refers to James i. 13. and iv. 1 [p].

Eusebius describes to us the opinions of his predecessors, in much the same manner as Origen; he says, that the Epistle is a disputed writing, because the ancients have seldom referred to it; yet he adds the qualification, that many consider it to be authentic [q].

This last opinion obtained the ascendancy in the sequel, and from the fourth century downwards, most of the Greek Teachers made use of it, out of respect to Ecclesiastical usage, in the same manner as of the rest of the Biblical writings.

SECTION CLV.

Besides, we may easily conceive, that the striking contrast between the doctrine of this Epistle and the doctrines of Paul must have impeded its more favorable reception. An author who so very much contradicted the doctrine of a recognized

[o] Comment. in Jo. Tom. xix. ἐαν δε λεγεται μεν πιστις, χωρις δε ἐργων τυγχανῃ, νεκρα ἐστιν ἡ τοιαυτη, ὡς ἐν τῃ φερομενῃ Ἰακωβου ἀνεγνωμεν· Tom. xxi. οὐ συγχωρηθεν ἀν ὑπο των παραδεχομενων το, πιστις χωρις ἐργων νεκρα ἐστιν.

[p] Dionysii Alexand. cognomento Magni, quæ supersunt, Romæ MDCCXCVII. Typ. Cogr. de prop. ed. Simon de Magistris, Episc. Cyrenens. In libello de Martyrio, c. 6. p. 32. c. 7. p. 33. et Fragm. ex Scholiis Græc. in Epistolam Jacobi. p. 200.

[q] Hist. Eccl. L. ii. c. 23. L. iii. c. 25.

Apostle, whose disciples and admirers were spread in very great numbers, in many countries; an author who so very much contradicted the Apostle of the Gentiles, must, at all events, even though he himself were an Apostle, meet with opponents. That he really met with them we need not be surprised. But it must be a phenomenon for any one to have invented this writing, and then for the sake of procuring to it authority to have ascribed it to James, without observing the necessary rules of precaution, of at least so framing it, as not to render its success difficult, as not to create against it distrust and opposition, at least, at the very onset.

Let us suppose it such a writing, as in its whole plan seemed to dispute the preceding Apostolical doctrines,—how many reasons must it first have had in its favor, how many proofs of its authenticity must it have adduced, ere it obtained so great an authority as to have been added in several Christian communities to the Sacred Writings—to the Apostolic codex! If the contradiction to Paul was no obstacle to such a step in several Churches, the conviction must certainly have powerfully pleaded it to have been the production of an inspired writer, whom no one dared to oppose.

SECTION CLVI.

Under what views did the Apostle compose this Epistle? There is no doubt, that he laboured to enforce his principal object, the recommendation of the moral law as the first aim of religion, with reference to his own times, and that he had in view the wants and situation of those, who were more im-

mediately around him, and who were entrusted to his guidance, as well as the rest of his cotemporaries and their circumstances.

If we were acquainted with the local state of things at that time, a peculiar light would be reflected upon a great part of it, and the composition, which has been commonly considered as a combination of individual sentences and interrupted passages, without a pervading consecutiveness, would obtain a real connection, which is imperceptible in the rapid transitions of the author, and which can only be perceived, by inserting the intermediate ideas from the aspect of the times, and thus filling up the gaps in the connection. With the materials, which we can at present call to our aid, this might not be *thoroughly* practicable, yet an imperfect picture of his age and condition may be an encouragement to produce a better.

One of the principal vexations of the author, as we perceive from the whole, were πολλοι διδασκαλοι, the number of presuming persons, who knew every thing in matters of religion, and with the most determined confidence decided without hesitation. He therefore brings the most heavy complaints against a small thing, against the tongue, which he accuses of occasioning great impediments to the doctrine, iii. 1—10.; i. 19, 20.

An opinion had been circulated, principally among the Jewish Christians, respecting the high efficacy of faith, according to which, a person by means of it might become acceptable to God, without the troublesome observation of the moral law and without virtue.

From what source this opinion sprung, it is not difficult to guess, as the supporters of it had availed themselves of Paul's arguments, by which this Apostle had represented the superfluousness of works

and the efficacy of faith in the Epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. By this, however, they did not understand the works of Judaism, but considered the Mosaic Law to be in continuance, as the rule of conduct and life, the Messiah and his word, as a subject, which they were bound to believe. Christianity was thereby placed in a subordinate relation to it; they were required to *approve it*, but they were also required to OBEY THE LAW.

These and similar questions respecting the Law and Christianity, about which for so long a time they could not agree, were never supported or contradicted without the most lively participation of the parties. This contest was prosecuted at Corinth and in the Churches of Galatia with vehemence and animosity; this also James witnessed and perceived in his district.

As to that which regards the external circumstances and the civil condition of the Jews and Jewish Christians, they were far from being agreeable. The Prætors, under all manner of pretexts, made extortions, and abused their legal authority for the sake of enriching themselves; a person was obliged to purchase with money his liberation from their prisons, as well as his safety and his rights; he might even purchase a license to commit crimes[r].

Thence many abject persons basely courted the favors of the rich, ἀνηρ χρυσοδακτυλιος [s], and the poor

[r] Acts xxiv. 26. Tacit. Hist. L. V. c. 10. The following passage refers, indeed, to the times immediately after the death of James[r]: it is however partly true of the administration of Felix: και χρημασι μεν οι δυνατοι τον Αλβινον προσελαμβανον, ωστε του στασιαζειν αυτοις παρειχεν αδειαν. Joseph. Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 24. p. 738. Basil. c. 14. ed. Haverc.

[s] Some of the Jews had been raised to the dignity of the Roman

man was obliged to submit to every sort of scornful treatment, even in the Christian assemblies, where it was least to be tolerated, ii. 2—10.

The public oppressions were every where perceptible, but the evils which the author foresaw, were still greater, 1. 3, 4. 12, 13, 14. The crying injuries, which were committed on all sides, openly called for the retributive punishment and chastisements of God, v. 1—7.

The Romans were not already on their march according to any of his declarations; the fermentation of boisterous spirits and the inefficacy of the laws had, in the mean time, already attained to such a height, that violent scenes, murder and manslaughter had ensued: μαχεσθε και πολεμειτε—φονευετε και ζηλουτε, iv. 1, 2, 3.; v. 6.

For, under Felix, and again under Portius Festus, desperate patriots marched through the country in whole bodies, and forcibly tore away with them the inhabitants of open places, and if they would not follow them, set fire to the villages, and enacted bloody scenes. They even made their appearance in the capital and at the feasts, where they mixed among the crowd of people, and committed many secret assassinations with concealed weapons[1].

The public disorder and disrespect for the laws had already arrived to such a pitch, that the author thought the moment of retribution not to be far removed; κριτης προ των θυρων εστηκως, v. 9.

To escape this many conceived the resolution of

Knights, ἀνδρες ἱππικου ταγματος. Joseph. Bel. Jud. ii. vol. c. 25. p. 740. Edition Basil, whence they are here called χρυσοδακτυλιοι, c. 14. n. 9. Haverc.

[1] Joseph. Antiq. Jud. L. xx. c. 6, 7. p. 617—620. Basil. c. 8. n. 5. sec. Haverc. cf. Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 13. n. 3. 5, 6.

seeking a residence in other countries [u]. They relied upon their spirit of traffic, by which they thought they could gain a livelihood, and hoped by means of their distance to extricate themselves from the general share of national misery, without reflecting that their fate, ἐαν ὁ Κυριος θεληση, and even their life, which they wished to save, lay at God's disposal, and that, if it had been so ordained by a Higher Power, they would be forced to undergo the punishment in their own native land, which they had oppressed and ill-treated, iv. 13—17.; v. 1—6.

In this state, under these circumstances, and in this degree of civil disorder, the author might probably have regarded his countrymen; for, although he wrote to the whole world, yet his native land passed more immediately before his eyes.

SECTION CLVII.

When was this Epistle written? It was composed after that to the Hebrews: it cannot, however, have been long composed, after the arrival of the Epistle to the Hebrews in Palestine, which happened in the beginning of the tenth year of Nero. For, if even the narrative of the death of James, the Brother of the Lord, which we find in Josephus (in the 20th book of the Archæology) be not from his own pen, yet it is certainly an account of great antiquity, since Origen in the commentaries on Matthew, and in the book against Celsus, as well as Eusebius, ascribe it to the Jewish writer.

[u] This emigration really took place in some degree under Albinus, and still more under Florus: Antiq. Jud. L. xx. c. ult. p. 624. and de Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 24. p. 738. c. 14. n. 2. Haverc.

According to this account, our James was murdered through the violence of the High Priest, in the interval between the death of Portius Festus and the expected arrival of Albinus as his successor.

No authentic writer clearly informs us when Albinus arrived, and how long he maintained his post under this rapid change of affairs; but thus much may be deduced from the accounts of Josephus respecting Gessius Florus, that this Albinus must have commenced his administration before the end of the tenth year of Nero, and that he could not have maintained it very long. Florus relieved Albinus; under him the Jewish war broke out, towards the end of the 12th year of Nero, and Florus at that time had at least already entered upon the second year of his government. Therefore the Epistle of James cannot possibly have been written before that to the Hebrews, nor before the beginning of the 10th year of Nero; also, not after the arrival of Albinus after the termination of this tenth year. It was written in this year of his death.

SECTION CLVIII.

We are now also required to state the contents of this composition. At the commencement he admonishes them to perseverance under the pressure of the circumstances of the times. The wisdom of life, (he continues), we receive from God, from whom we must ask it, i. 9. Let no one think too confidently of himself: we are all frail creatures: blessed is the man, who endureth temptation! But no one must ascribe to God our temptations to evil; the cause of them lies in ourselves. From God all good

rather proceeds, as well as the excellent gift of Christianity, with which we should not only be acquainted, but practise it in word and deed, 27.

Christianity knows no distinction between rich and poor. This should so much the less be overlooked, because religion requires the fulfilment of all the commandments in their whole extent—ii. 13. It is not a mere faith, a thing merely admitted, but a law of virtues to be practised.—iii.

Those, who stand forward as teachers, attach to themselves many responsibilities: we are liable to err with nothing more easily, than with the tongue. Let him, who is particularly endowed with religious knowledge, show it in his conduct. Wisdom is a child of heaven, gentle, peaceable, without enmity—iv. Your wicked and turbulent behaviour shows, that you do not yet possess it;—therefore pray ye for it, and humbly draw near to God. Judge not others,—there is only One Judge for all men,—iv. 13.

Let no one imagine it to be in his power to withdraw himself from the punishment suspended over his country. Yea, ye rich men, ye shall even here be obliged to incur the punishment, which your arrogance deserves,—v. 7.

But persevere all of ye with patience; keep in view the ancient examples of suffering; the day of accomplishment,—The Judge is at hand. Swear not: every word, which is given, is already sacred. If any one be sick, let him call the Elders to anoint him and to pray over him. The prayer of the righteous availeth much. Finally, let every one cheerfully show to others the right way.

SECTION CLIX.

And now, by way of conclusion, how can the contradiction between Paul and James be reconciled? The first maintains the sanctifying power of faith without works; but the latter, the unfruitfulness of faith without them. What did each of them understand by works and faith?

Both of the treatises, in which Paul delivers his assertions, are directed against Judaism and against the obligation of its precepts in the Christian religion. Faith, is therefore, according to the object of this religion, opposed to Judaism and to the works of the Law.

This opposition is, Rom. iii. 21.—iv., very distinctly expressed, where the favour and pardon of God are solely ascribed to Faith, χωρις νομου and χωρις ἐργων νομου. The subsequent example of Abraham, which is adduced in proof of this doctrine, is treated by the author in such a point of view, as to show from it, that without the Jewish code and the observation of its injunctions, which as yet no where existed, the Father of the nation had obtained the favor of God, δια της πιστεως, iv—v., etc.

But this πιστις is to him a confidence full of hope in God's assurances, ἐλπις, in reference to the ἐπαγγελια, which he had long since given, relative to the blessedness of mankind by him, as we have had occasion to observe on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Sect. 130.

With James, πιστις is a recognition of the doctrines of Christianity, the Christian theory, of which we approve; ii. 19. 14, 15. and ἐργα are the active

performance of its precepts; this, therefore, viz. the acknowledgment of religious truth as a point merely to be regarded, without application to human actions and deeds, is a dead and unfruitful knowledge, i. 23.

Each, therefore, on his side has seen and judged correctly, and neither assails the notions and representations, nor disparages the doctrine of the other.

But James openly attacks the individual arguments, with which Paul supports his doctrine, and in the treatment of his subject discloses such special references to the writings of Paul, that it would indeed appear inexplicable how all this could so have occurred, if he had not at the time these writings in his mind. The contradiction is therefore not only confined to this, but it even arises from a misunderstanding, which is far worse.

We must, however, consider, that James wrote to the dispersed Jews, and contradicts Paul in the sense, in which they had accepted and understood him. If these did not comprehend him; if they substituted their own opinions for his; if they would not comprehend that Moses and the legal ceremonies were no longer the precepts for religious actions and works; if they availed themselves of his arguments in support of their own opinions, and thence justified the conceptions, which they had substituted for his; if then James attacked the erroneous interpretations, which they made of Paul and his proofs, can it be laid to his charge, that he was one, who did not comprehend and did not understand Paul?

By no means:—James did not raise himself up against Paul, but only against an error of the age, which the Jewish converts, for the sake of skreening their own prejudices, had explained and deduced from him, the consequences of which were most evident throughout his neighbourhood; it was to be feared,

that it might thence be communicated to all the Believers converted from Judaism, and that it might destroy far and wide every object and hope of Christianity. He, therefore, as Chief of the Church at Jerusalem opposed with his authority this event, which was to be guarded against, and addressed himself to all the believing Jews on the earth, for the sake of preserving the laws of virtue and of practical religion.

SECTION CLX.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF THE APOSTLE PETER.

This Epistle according to its inscription is directed to the Jewish Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Asia, i. 1.

That which strikes us at the very beginning, if it be attentively considered, is the great similarity which prevails between this and some of Paul's Epistles, which were directed to these Provinces, with respect to the ideas, the words and language, in which they are communicated, and even to the very plan. The observation is certain, the proofs of it are visible, and the explanation also is not difficult.

Peter had not seen the Asiatic provinces; they were situated in the circuit of Paul's department, who had travelled through them, instructed them, and even at a distance and in his prison did not lose sight of them. He was acquainted with their mode of life, foibles, virtues and imperfections, their whole condition, and the manner in which they ought to be treated.

If now some urgent necessity demanded the in-

tervention of Peter, his consolation or instruction in such a case, the Epistles of his venerable colleague might furnish him with directions for his conduct. We find, that here principally the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, and the 1st of Timothy were of service to our Apostle, and that he was often directed by them in matters and in his mode of treatment.

After the formulary of salutation, Peter begins thus, i. 3. εὐλογητος ὁ Θεος και πατηρ τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ ἀναγεννησας, κ. τ. λ. Precisely in the same manner, Paul also begins to the Ephesians, i. 3. εὐλογητος ὁ Θεος και πατηρ τοῦ Κυριοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ εὐλογησας, κ'. τ'. λ'.

Peter now applies himself to the recommendation of Christianity, of its efficacy as conducive to happiness, its exalted founder, his greatness and beneficent compassion, which deserves the adoration of angels and men. All this in the ideas and application nearly resembles Paul in the introduction to the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians.

After the conclusion of this prologue he makes the following transition, ii. 1. ἀποθεμενοι οὐν πᾶσαν κακιαν, και παντα δολον, και ὑποκρισεις και φθονους και πᾶσας καταλαλιας. This transition also occurs in the Epistle to the Colossians, iii. 8. νῦνι δε ἀποθεσθε και ὑμεῖς τα παντα, θυμον, κακιαν, βλασφημιαν, αἰσχρολογιαν, the whole difference being in a change of synonyms.

When Peter speaks of their civil and domestic condition, as the case required, he again consults Paul respecting that, of which it would be most appropriate to remind them.

1 Pet. ii. 13.	1 Tim. ii. 1.
ὑποταγητε οὐν	παρακαλῶ οὐν πρῶτον παντων ποιεῖσθαι δεησεις, προσευχας, ἐντευξεις, εὐχαριστιας, ὑπερ
πασῃ ἀνθρωπινῃ κτισει,	παντων τῶν ἀνθρωπων,
εἰτε βασιλεῖ,	ὑπερ βασιλεων,
ὡς ὑπερεχοντι·	και παντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῃ ὀντων·
• • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • •
ὀτι οὑτως ἐστι	τοῦτο γαρ καλον και ἀποδεκτον
το θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ.	ἐνωπιον....τοῦ Θεοῦ.
1 Pet. ii. 18.	**Ephes. vi. 5.**
οἰ οἰκεται	οἰ δουλοι,
ὑποτασσομενοι	ὑπακουετε
ἐν παντι φοβῳ	τοις κυριοις κατα σαρκα
τοις δεσποταις.	μετα φοβου και τρομου.
1 Pet. iii. 1.	**Col. iii. 18.**
ὁμοιως αἰ γυναικες	αἰ γυναικες,
ὑποτασσομεναι	ὑποτασσεσθε
τοις ἰδιοις ἀνδρασιν,	τοις ἰδιοις ἀνδρασιν.
• • • • • • • •	**1 Tim. ii. 9.**
ὑποπτευσαντες την ἐν φοβῳ	ἐν καταστολῃ κοσμιῳ μετα αἰδους
ἁγνην ἀναστροφην ὑμῶν,	και σωφροσυνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτας
ὠν ἐστω οὐχ ὁ ἐξωθεν	μη.....
ἐμπλοκης τριχων,	ἐν πλεγμασιν
και περιθεσεως χρυσιων,	ἠ χρυσῳ,
ἠ ἐνδυσεως ἱματιων	ἠ μαργαριταις, ἠ ἱματισμῳ
κοσμος.	πολυτελεῖ.

The ideas, the contents, and the number of sentences are tolerably alike, and the deviations in the expression even show a more than accidental affinity. If ἐν ὑπεροχῃ ὠν be used instead of ὑπερεχων, and πλεγμασιν instead of ἐμπλοκη τριχῶν, and περιθεσις χρυσιων instead of χρυσος, it rather indicates a design of avoiding the identity of expression than an actual difference. But Peter also is so far from denying his acquaintance with the Epistles of Paul,

that he rather in express terms refers his readers to these compositions of his beloved brother, 2 Peter iii. 15., reminds them of them, and recommends them to them.

SECTION CLXI.

But we find besides some passages, which are perfectly uniform with James, for instance,

1 Pet. i. 6, 7.	James i. 2.
ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ὀλιγον ἀρτι.... λυπηθεντες ἐν ποικιλοις πειρασμοις ἱνα το δοκιμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πιστεως • • • • • • • • • εὑρεθῇ εἰς ἐπαινον, κ'. τ'. λ'.	πᾶσαν χαραν ἡγησασθε, ὁταν περιπεσητε πειρασμοις ποικιλοις, γινωσκοντες, ὁτι το δοκιμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πιστεως ὑπομονην κατεργαζεται, κ'. τ'. λ'.
1 Pet. i. 24.	James i. 10.
διοτι πᾶσα σαρξ ὡς χορτος, και πᾶσα δοξα αὐτης ὡς ἀνθος χορτου· και ἐξηρανθη ὁ χορτος, και το ἀνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξεπεσε.	ὁτι παρελευσεται, ὡς ἀνθος χορτου· ἀνετειλε ὁ ἡλιος συν τῷ καυσωνι, και ἐξηρανε τον χορτον, και το ἀνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξεπισε.
1 Pet. v. 5, 6.	James iv. 6—10.
ὁτι ὁ Θεος ὑπερηφανοις ἀντιτασσεται, ταπεινοις δε διδωσι χαριν. ταπεινωθητε οὐν ὑπο την κραταιαν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἱνα ὑμᾶς ὑψωσῃ.	ὁτι ὁ Θεος ὑπερηφανοις ἀντιτασσεται, ταπεινοις δε διδωσι χαριν.... ταπεινωθητε ἐνωπιον του Κυριου, και ὑψωσει ὑμᾶς.

The passage 1 Pet. v. 5. and James iv. 6. is taken, it is true, from Proverbs iii. 34., and it might have happened by chance, that they therein coincided with each other; except that the similar conclusion thence deduced, which is the same both in extent and words, contradicts in this place the probable effect of chance. There is, moreover, another instance, 1 Pet. iv. 8., James v. 20., where an equal chance must have led them again for the second time to the same passage of the same book, ὁτι ἀγαπη καλυψει πληθος ἁμαρτιῶν—and ἐπιστρεψας ἁμαρτωλον.... και καλυψει πληθος ἁμαρτιῶν. Cf. Proverbs x. 12.

Which of them transcribed these parts from the treatise of the other into his own, depends probably upon the question,—"Which of them first published his Epistle?" But this is not simply a matter of curiosity, but of consequences, one of which we shall here immediately mention. For if, as it is really the case, Peter composed his Epistle after James, the passages quoted must certainly have been transferred from James; if so, could we well require a stronger proof, that the Epistle of James is an authentic monument of Apostolical antiquity? Could the declarations of other witnesses indeed better satisfy us on the point, than such a proof, which refers us back to so high and so unexceptionable an authority?

SECTION CLXII.

The main purport of the Epistle is to inspire the sufferers with courage and consolation; and its contents are, as follow:

I greet you through Jesus Christ, through whom

God leads us to glory, if we endure with constancy the present trials, which are intended to prove us. For the end of them is a blessing, which the author of them himself, THAT EXALTED PERFECTER OF ALL, whom the ancient world wished in vain to behold, has acquired by sufferings, i. 13.

Therefore prepare yourselves for the period, when this reward shall be distributed. Be ye worthy of the Lord, ye who are purchased by his sufferings, and be worthy of the hopes, which we have through him. We are elected to a higher vocation, than the enjoyment of this transient existence, ii. 1.

Lay aside every thing that defiles you, and renders you unworthy of him. He is the central point of all our hopes, our pattern and our Sanctifier, ii. 11. So direct your course of life, that no one may be able to calumniate you as evil doers; be without dissimulation obedient to every power and constituted authority, ii. 18.

This precept is also extended to servants and slaves with respect to their masters; for to them also is the patiently and nobly suffering Jesus a pattern, iii. So also should the women submissively and modestly place their greatest ornament in the quiet exercise of virtue; the men on the other hand should take care of them and honour them, iii. 8.

All should be full of sympathy, full of love, forbearing one towards another, and without guile, ready at every moment to justify themselves, that our opposers and calumniators thereby may be ashamed; for, Christ has once for all done every thing necessary to procure to us a good conscience and a state which is pleasing to God, iv.

Our past transgressions, for which Jesus has suffered, should no more be visible in us; but we should rather prepare ourselves in our life for a great catas-

trophe, which is no longer far distant, iv. 12. We shall on its arrival have an opportunity of suffering with a patience full of joy, as Jesus did; happy will it be for us, if we are ill-treated as his disciples, and not as criminals!—v.

Ye ministers, watch therefore over your flocks, ye who are under them, show yourselves as such! But do ye all divest yourselves of every temporal care; be on your guard, for our trial is great, and God grant to you strength! I have already once written unto you by Silvanus, and I now greet you again.

SECTION CLXIII.

We must close our eyes, if we did not perceive that the whole scope of this Epistle is directed to one principal end—namely, to prepare the communities of Asia Minor for heavy sufferings. The moral instructions are only subordinate to this: the admonitions to renounce evil; to obtain a pure conscience; to refute the calumnies of the time by innocence; to abstain from vehement contradictions; to show respect for the magistracy; to unite with each other in so much the greater love and fidelity, etc.—are only directions for alleviating their fearful destiny, or for bearing it in a more exemplary manner. In the same manner, the repeated references to the pattern of Jesus in sufferings and death, are intended to strengthen them under calamitous occurrences. The address likewise to the slaves has a reference, often experienced, to the unhappy days, in which they had become the informers and betrayers of their masters on account of real or imaginary wrongs and sufferings. We, therefore, justly

inquire after the events in history, for which the author of this Epistle wished to prepare the Communities of the five Provinces.

1. He sketches its description in the following traits. Let it not be a matter of surprise, if a fiery trial shall await the believers, as the test of their firmness, since they only thus partake of a lot similar to that of the Founder of their Religion, iv. 12, 13. The dreaded trial he announces as a Divine Judgment, which the Lord would commence in his own household, but which might end so much the more terribly with those, who are not his, iv. 17.; or as a judgment-day, which God has appointed over whole nations for the decision of their fate יום פקדה, Isaiah x. 3., עת פקדה Jerem. x. 15. καιρος ἐπισκοπης, Luke xix. 44. Such a day, ἡμερα ἐπισκοπης, ii. 12., awaits them, which they should endure for the honour of God. The comparison of the before-mentioned passages may represent the force of the image in its whole light. Farther on he declares, that the Christian enemy and opposer of all that is more excellent, is now in action, and seeks his victim like a voracious lion; also that the sufferings in prospect shall not merely be fulfilled in one confined circle, but upon all their fellow-believers ἀδελφοτητι, not only in the Roman state, but also farther throughout the world, ἐν κοσμῳ, upon the *socii* and *fœderati*; upon all, who wish to please the Romans, v. 8, 9.

In these traits, from which the picture of the state of the Christians in the five Provinces is put together, not only the individual local disturbances excited by the Jews, or the sudden injuries, which here and there the populace might have allowed to themselves, are denoted, but they indicate, throughout Asia Minor and farther still throughout the world, a time of terror

and a general calamity to the Christian school. The greatness and universality of the evil absolutely require, that it should proceed from the Highest Power of the State, without which so widely an extended and so simultaneous an effect is not conceivable. But now there exists no event, which could have produced such great and general effects, if it be not the first Christian persecution, in which Nero, with ingenious wantonness, gave the original model for others.

2. A second criterion is contained in the passages ii. 12., iii. 16., iv. 16. An accusation had gone abroad against the Professors of the new doctrine, that they were criminals, κακοποιοι; so much so indeed, that the name Χριστιανος already denoted a person worthy of punishment. Hitherto all complaints referred to a difference of religious views, in which the Jews, with the exception of the complaints by the company of silversmiths at Ephesus, were the accusers. At Corinth, Gallio drove them from the judgment-seat, and pronounced with justice, that no iniquity and misdeed was brought before him, Acts xviii. 14—16. Felix and Festus, together with King Agrippa, considered the accusation, though the High Priests appeared as the accusers, as a dispute on account of doctrinal opinions, and discovered no crime, Acts xxiv—xxvii. At Ephesus even one of the Presidents of the city took up the defence of the Christians, and pronounced them innocent of any crime against the Goddess and the Sanctuary, Acts xix. 37. The name Χριστιανος had still, in the 7th year of Nero, so little of that which was odious in the eyes of a Roman Tribunal, that Agrippa did not deem its appropriation degrading or detrimental to his Royal Dignity, ἐν ὀλιγῳ με πειθεις, Χριστιανον γενεσθαι, Acts xxvi. 28.

They were therefore still so far from the idea of generally accusing the fraternity of criminal actions, that no trace of it appears until three years afterwards, when Nero charged the Christians with his own crime,—the tremendous conflagration in the capital —and dragged them to punishment as the perpetrators of the atrocity. Here they occur for the first time in the Roman history, as a peculiar and new Society, as *Christiani* so called from their founder *Christus*, upon which occasion, many heavy accusations are heaped upon them [a].

3. They were obliged to hold themselves in readiness to defend themselves, iii. 15., and to be dragged to punishment, and not only to be exposed to raillery, but (by virtue of the *tertium comparationis*, of which the Apostle makes use) to suffer punishment as thieves, murderers, and disturbers of the peace (little as they were chargeable with these accusations) that is to say, punishments of death, or punishments appointed for capital crimes; and to all this they were liable in the capacity of Χριστιανοι, iv. 15, 16. Accordingly he expresses himself in this manner: let him, who by the will of God is appointed to suffer, commit the keeping of his soul to the Creator, iv. 19; or, in other words, die the death of a pious man, Luke xxiii. 46., Acts vii. 59 [b]. We no where find a conjectural reason, much less a historical trace, that out of Palestine, the punishment of death had been inflicted upon Christians, on account of their religion, in the Roman dominions, until the time, which we have mentioned.

The first examples of such abuses were presented at Rome under the Consuls Lecanius and M. Lici-

[a] Tacit. Annal. xv. 44.

[b] Pott. Epistolæ Cathol. Vol. ii. editio 2da; ad 1 Pet. iv. 19.

nius Crassus, according to the annals of Tacitus, in the 10th consulate under the reign of Nero.

The commencement of the conflagration, which was the cause or the occasion of the persecution, occurred xiii. Kal. Sextiles[c] in the last half of July; but the persecution did not yet begin. Devices of every description were adopted to appease the indignation of those, who had suffered by it: days of expiation were instituted to appease the Gods, and the hatred which fell upon Nero was endeavoured to be extinguished in every possible manner. At last, when nothing availed, they looked round on every side for men, who could be thrust forward as the criminals;—the selection fell upon the Christians.

The Epistle cannot have been written before these scenes of horror, which could only have taken place late in this year, and which must have filled with consternation all who bore the name of Christians.

And not only could it not have been written before, but not until a considerable time afterwards. For we must at least allow the expiration of a few months, before the account of it was spread in the Eastern provinces. Some time again must have elapsed, before the Apostle could have received accounts from thence, respecting the condition and the fears of the communities, and respecting their frightful anticipations.

It is, therefore, certain, that the Epistle was not written in this year; but its origin falls in the subsequent consulate, or in the 11th year of the reign of Nero.

Whether the persecution had extended also without the walls of the capital into the more distant

[c] Lipsius in Excurs. A. ad Tac. Ann. L. xv.

provinces of the Empire, or whether, at this time, it was confined only to the fears of these countries, history does not mention. Peter rather considers the misfortune more to be apprehended, than decided, i. 6. εἰ δεον ἐστι, iii. 17. εἰ θελει το θελημα τοῦ Θεοῦ; if it be necessary, if God's will so ordain it. But the fear was well-grounded; for what was there not to be feared, when in the central point of the Empire, and of the whole power of the state, such accusations were made against a society, and when in their punishment all preceding inventions of cruelty were exceeded?

The prospects were terrible, even if they were never realized; the agony of death was in them, even if a higher hand averted the blow. This terrible event must have spread terror throughout all Christendom; it was certainly the most important occurrence, which it had experienced since its foundation, and we should have great cause for surprise, if it had occasioned from no quarter a consolatory Epistle, if no trace of it had been left in the records of the Apostles.

SECTION CLXIV.

We here again recal to mind what we have before shown respecting the Epistle of James from internal criteria, and our analytical examination of them; or as it would rather have been called in another case, from principles of higher criticism,—namely, that the Epistle was written in Palestine by a native of Palestine, and among the several of this name, by James the Brother of the Lord. From this, either Peter has appropriated to himself meta-

phors and sentences, according to Sect. 161, or, vice versâ, James has extracted them from the Epistle of Peter; respecting which the relative *time*, in which both writings stand to each other, can alone yield a solution. Respecting Peter's Epistle we possess a correct determination of time: it was written in the eleventh year of Nero; whereas, on the other hand, the Brother of the Lord, to whom we ascribe, not arbitrarily and without reason, the Epistle under the name of James, died in the tenth year of Nero, Sect. 157. Consequently, Peter, who wrote later, presents himself as a witness for the previous existence of the Epistle of James, in whose testimony we also find the assurance, that it comes from a James, whom Peter, in appropriating his words, did not consider beneath his own rank, or of authority inferior to that of the Apostolic office. Since, therefore, the Epistle of James is not deficient in internal proofs, but only in external authentication, principally among the Greeks, so Peter's recognition of it is the most perfect compensation for these.

SECTION CLXV.

THE first Epistle of Peter was written from Babylon; v. 13. For ἡ ἐν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, is called συνεκλεκτη, *i. e.* ἐκκλησια, in reference to the ἐκλεκτοις παρεπιδημοις, i. 1. The most modern expositor of the Epistle is inclined to understand by ἡ ἐν Βαβυλωνι συνεκλεκτη, *the woman chosen with him at Babylon*, THE WIFE OF PETER, as if the Apostle wished to say, *my wife, whom I have left behind in Babylon, greets you*: and founds upon it the conclusion, that Peter therefore wrote his Epistle any where, but in

Babylon [d]. How then did she know, that her husband was writing to the people of Asia Minor? or how did he receive the commission from his wife to greet the communities of the five provinces? By letters or messengers? But a thing of this nature would have been tedious, and attended with considerable delay; in that case Peter would have commenced his Epistle at Babylon, and finished it on his journey. At all events, according to this opinion, Peter had been shortly before at Babylon, where he left his wife, and received accounts of the state of the provinces of Asia Minor, and intended to write to them as soon as possible. At all events, likewise, the Epistle was written at no great distance from Babylon.

At the mention of this name we first think of the celebrated Babylon on the Euphrates; there was another also in Egypt not far from Memphis [e]; lastly, some would understand Rome by Babylon, because the Apocalypse makes use of this metonymy respecting Rome; but they do not consider, that this may be very possible in a work, whose whole plan is symbolical, but on the other hand would only be credible in the subscription of an Epistle, if *arcana nomina Ecclesiarum* had existed among Christians.

Where simply Babylon is mentioned, we should imagine, that it was the ancient city, famed all over the world, which first arises to every one's mind, *Babylon per eminentiam;* one less celebrated would have been designated by a mark of distinction, for instance, *Babylon in Ægypt.*

But it is again objected, whether there were Jews

[d] Pott. Epist. Cathol. Vol. ii. Editio altera ad; 1 Pet. v. 13.

[e] Diodor. L. 1. c. 56. Joseph. Ant. L. ii. c. 15. Antonini itinerar. p. 169. edit. Wesseling.

in ancient Babylon? At first the question sounds ridiculous:—but how often does Josephus speak of Jews, and afterwards the Talmud of them, and of their famous school in Babylon? However the passages of Josephus refer to a preceding period, and those of the Talmud to one considerably subsequent. In the latter times of Caius Caligula their situation had been very much altered. The Babylonians, grievously offended by the haughtiness of a Jew who had raised himself to power, expelled the Jews forcibly from Babylon, who fled to Seleucia. Five years afterwards the plague fully extirpated the rest, who had been tolerated there probably on account of connections or particular considerations. Those at Seleucia were massacred some *time afterwards*, to the number of 50,000, and those who escaped sought their welfare at Ctesiphon, where they thought themselves so little secure for any length of time, that they retired to Naharde and Nesibis[f]. This animosity after the lapse of a few years had scarcely so far subsided, as for the Jews to venture to return to Babylon.

But others were not wanting, to whom the instructions of the Apostle were welcome and acceptable; the σεβομενοι or pious Gentiles showed themselves every where more inclined than the Jews to receive the doctrine. Such existed in the East, as well as among the Greeks and the Romans[g].

But let us also cast a look at the Ægyptian Babylon. If we admit, that Peter had collected a society here, or visited one already in existence, for the purpose of ascertaining its doctrines and condition,

[f] Joseph. Ant. L. xviii. c. 9. n. 8, 9.

[g] Jos. Bell. Jud. L. ii. c. 20. n. 2. and c. 18. n. 2. contra Apion. L. ii. c. 10.

and of regulating all that required to be corrected and improved, the occasion of an attested fact is thereby explained. Mark, as history relates, (Section 69.) had gone from Rome, where he had written his Gospel under the direction of Peter, to Egypt, and had there undertaken the superintendence of the Christian communities. What now could be more consistent with circumstances, than that Mark, after the death of Peter, should think it incumbent on the duty of his vocation to guide and uphold those societies, which he had laboured with Peter to establish and regulate?

But again, on the other hand, we are interrupted by the circumstance, that this Babylon, according to the description of Strabo[h], seems to have been no more than a garrison, which was occupied by one of the three Roman Legions, which guarded Egypt[i].

SECTION CLXVI.

ON THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER AND THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

The first Epistle of Peter had not merely a general, but also a more particular destination to some individual community, or to several, over which a certain Sylvanus superintended, perhaps he who was at one time a companion of Paul. Peter had already once

[h] Strabo Geogr. L. xvii. p. 555. 1ma Casaub. and 2da Casaub. p. 807.

[i] Ahmed Ibn Yusuf Altifasi pretends, that all Egypt was formerly called Babylon: وانه جاء الي ارض مصر و كانت (*scil. Seth.*) قدمي بابلون—See the Preface.—*Translator.*

written and given directions respecting doubts with regard to the doctrinal system, 1 Ep. v. 12., but nothing of it[k] remains, not even a definite notice of the community, which this Epistle most immediately concerned.

The apprehension respecting the maintenance of the doctrines and their purity, in the meantime, became more and more well-founded. False teachers gained the ascendancy, obtained followers, and perplexed the Churches with heresies, whilst they were trembling under the terrors of Nero's persecution. Asia Minor had, it appears, no Apostle at that time; Paul must still have been in the West, and John no longer at Ephesus, as they sought for assistance at a distance. This want of a present authority, which might keep the Heretics within bounds, was naturally a great help to their undertaking, of which they did not omit to avail themselves.

To that place, to which this lost Epistle, which defended the orthodoxy of Sylvanus and which recommended his fidelity in these affairs, was directed, i. v. 12.; to that place, to which also the first of the extant Epistles was most immediately directed,—the second also went, 2 Pet. iii. 1. Peter also only calls it *the second* TO THEM, δευτεραν υμιν γραφω επιστολην, whence he seems to have considered the Epistle δια Σιλουανου as a private letter, and Sylvanus as his agent, by whom he caused something to be communicated[l] to the Church, without openly publishing

[k] See a former note on § 98. from which, for the same reasons, it is evident, that there is no authority for supposing Peter to have alluded to any other but the present Epistle.—*Translator.*

[l] A sober critic, arguing from the Epistle without seeking to support a pre-conceived theory, and bearing in mind the Hebraisms with which the New Testament abounds, could only infer from 1 Peter v. 12. that Silvanus was the bearer of that identical Epistle, not that he had been the bearer of one antecedent to it. The private com-

the Epistle itself, which might have contained some particular communications.

The Epistle of Jude treats of the same errors, opposes the same persons, with whom the second of Peter is employed; the cause, therefore, is the same: the end and place of destination are the same. Now since the second of Peter is directed to Asia Minor, the Epistle of Jude can be assigned to no other country, not even to Persia, as some have assigned it.

The tradition, that this Apostle wrote against the Magi and Persians, is indeed so far grounded, inasmuch as he opposed the doctrines of the Magi; yet the leap from these doctrines to the Persians is a bold hypothesis of a historical conjecturer, who has enriched that which is true in the account by an addition of his own.

At all events the Epistle of Peter remains for us, with regard to the local destination which it might have had, the sole and the surest guide, if the assertion be correct, that the two treatises, which are not written with general views, but composed against certain persons, against particular doctrines and absurdities, pre-suppose a similar circumstantial detail and locality, according to which they were contemplated and arranged.

SECTION CLXVII.

The second Epistle of Peter has the following contents: endeavour always to increase in the know-

munications, which Hug conjectures this fabulous Epistle to have contained, have also no existence beyond that, which the excursions of his fancy have created for them.—*Translator.*

ledge of the blessed doctrine of Jesus, which generates every virtue, of which none remains unrewarded, i. 12. Therefore I exhort you again; and I, as a present witness to that which Jesus did and taught, can lead you with a greater certainty to this knowledge than those, who wish to mislead you by false delusions. ii.

False teachers have introduced themselves among you, whose destruction is certain. God did not even spare the angels who disobeyed; he has placed before our eyes examples of punishment in the whole primitive world, particularly in Sodom and Gomorrha; much more, therefore, may those expect it, who abandon themselves to every uncleanness, and blaspheme God and the spiritual world, in which even Angels did not indulge themselves against inferior beings. Full of impurity and covetousness they strive after lucre like Balaam:—they are thunderclouds[m], without water. iii.

Call to your minds the instructions of the prophets and Apostles, who have prophesied unto you the arrival of the Lord and the relapse of the earth into its Chaos, when he shall come as a Judge. Be ye prepared for it, as Paul has already exhorted you.

[m] A proverb very similar is current in the East. A liberal man is compared to rain or clouds pregnant with it, a man merely affecting liberality to cloud charged with thunder and lightning, threatening rain, but withholding it from the earth. Hence, they say, رُبَّ صلف تحت راعدة *There is often but little water under a thunder cloud.—Translator.*

SECTION CLXVIII.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

MEN have crept in unawares among you; having been of old ripe for destruction, they deny our Lord. Recollect, that God punished the Jews, when they seceded from him, and even the disobedient Angels; that he also made Sodom and Gomorrha, on account of their abominations, a monument of chastisement. These persons, full of lust, blaspheme God and his Spirits, though Michael not even presumed to do so against Satan. They thirst after gain like Balaam, they perish like Korah, they are waterless, stormy clouds, roaring waves. Enoch has already prophesied the judgment, which awaits their crimes. But do ye remain constant in the Faith and in Love, in which God will strengthen you.

SECTION CLXIX.

THE similarity between the second chapter of the second Epistle of Peter and the little essay of Jude is so great, that it has struck every one. The similarity itself is, therefore, not an object, which first requires to be elucidated, but the cause of it demands a closer investigation.

Was it then, Jude who borrowed from Peter, or was it Peter who made use of the small composition of Jude in his Epistle? Yet it is but little probable,

that Jude, since he only wrote twenty-five verses, should even in these few lines have resorted to another's assistance for ideas and words.

But if we compare the two with each other, the critic cannot fail to perceive which was the original. The language of Jude is simple, unpremeditated, and expressive without ornament: that of Peter is artificial, and has the appearance of embellishment and amplification.

Jude 8.	2 Pet. ii. 10.
ὁμοιως μεντοι και ουτοι ἐνυπνιαζομενοι, σαρκα μεν μιαινουσι, κυριοτητα δε ἀθετουσι, δοξας δε βλασφημουσι·	μαλιστα δε τους ὀπισω σαρκος ἐν ἐπιθυμιᾳ μιασμου πορευομενους, και κυριοτητος καταφρονουντας· τολμηται, αὐθαδεις, δοξας οὐ τρεμουσι βλασφημουντες.
Jude 10.	2 Pet. ii. 12.
ουτοι δε, ὁσα μεν οὐκ οἰδασι, βλασφημουσι, ὁσα δε φυσικως, ὡς τα ἀλογα ζωα ἐπιστανται, ἐν τουτοις φθειρονται.	ουτοι δε, ὡς ἀλογα ζωα φυσικα, γεγεννημενα εἰς ἀλωσιν και φθοραν ἐν οἰς ἀγνοουσι βλασφημουντες, ἐν φθορᾳ αὐτων καταφθαρησονται.
Jude 16.	2 Pet. ii. 18.
ουτοι εἰσι . . . κατα τας ἐπιθυμιας αὐτων πορευομενοι, και το στομα αὐτων λαλει ὑπερογκα.	ὑπερογκα γαρ ματαιοτητος φθεγγομενοι, δελεαζουσιν ἐν ἐπιθυμιαις σαρκος, ἀσελγειαις τους ὀλιγους ἀποφυγοντας, τους ἐν πλανῃ ἀναστρεφομενους.

In the following passage I have transposed Jude, for he must be read from the bottom upwards, for us more readily to perceive the parallel.

Jude 4.	2 Pet. ii. 1, 2, 3.
ἀρνούμενοι δεσπότην μετατιθέντες	καὶ τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι
εἰς ἀσελγειαν ἀσεβεῖς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν χαριν	ἐπαγοντες ἑαυτοῖς ταχινην ἀπωλειαν, ... ταῖς ἀσελγειαις δι' οὓς ἡ ὁδος τῆς ἀληθειας βλασφημηθησεται . . . .
εἰς το κριμα προγεγραμμενοι οἱ παλαι.	οἷς το κριμα ἐκ παλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπωλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυσταζει.

When in the first passage Jude simply says, σαρκα μιαινουσι, but Peter ὀπισω σαρκος ἐν ἐπιθυμιᾳ πορευομενοι —Jude κυριοτητα ἀθετοῦσι; Peter, on the other hand, κυριοτητος καταφρονοῦντες, τολμηται, αὐθαδεῖς:—when Jude says, δοξας βλασφημοῦσι; Peter δοξας οὐ τρεμουσι βλασφημοῦντες: it is evident that the passages of Peter are periphrases and amplifications. The case is the same with the other passsages quoted; they are moulded from the more simple language of Jude into one more ornamented, they are adorned with participles, and occasionally manifest rhetorical amplifications.

If this observation be correct, (for it is so very natural, that it could not easily be contradicted,) the conclusion is already at hand; namely, that Peter had, therefore, the Epistle of Jude before him, and in his own manner applied it to his purposes [n].

[n] Some have also been desirous of explaining the similarity between Peter and Jude from the use of the same sources, such as for instance the Book, from whence they have extracted the account of a dispute of the Angel with the inferior Spirits. If the similarity however did

Both also mention a dispute, which the Angels conducted with such forbearance even against fallen Spirits, that they did not indulge themselves in any reviling or abuse against them, 2 Pet. ii. 2.; Jude 9.

This erudition is not of that nature, which could be supposed to be possessed by all readers; at least it was not in the sacred books of the Jews, and could only be known to them by means of other reading, or peculiar instruction. It was, therefore, necessary, that it should be circumstantially treated, or at least be described by such clear definitions, that the author's meaning, and the occurrence to which he alludes, might thence be observed.

With Jude this is the case; he states the matter distinctly, and expressly names the dispute of Michael with the Devil respecting the body of Moses. But Peter rests so much in generals, and explains himself respecting it so indefinitely, that we could not at all have guessed what he had in view in this passage, if we were not in possession of Jude. So must it have been with every one in the ancient world, well as he might in other respects have known the occurrence between the Devil and the Archangel:— he must have obtained information from some other source, concerning the Apostle's allusions, if he would be certain of the sense of these passages.

The conduct of Peter in this passage, and the mode of treatment, which he has adopted in it, shew,

not extend farther than the coincidence in such learned matters, this proposition might be admitted. But it extends also to the description of their cotemporaries, to the picture, which they sketch of these false teachers, and to the representation of their faults and heresies, which they certainly did not take from more ancient sources. It extends even to the salutation in both the Epistles, which is not to be attributed to any source: χαρις ὑμῖν και εἰρηνη πληθυνθειη, and Jude ἐλεος ὑμῖν και εἰρηνη . . . . . πληθυνθειη.

therefore, that he imagined Jude to have been already in the hands of his readers; that he thought that he could take it for granted, that they understood every thing well, without the necessity of a greater circumstantiality, or a clearer exposition on his part °.

° The account of this contention will be found in the last Section of דברים רבה, on which Bashuysen has copiously written, and the multitude of fables, which were invented from the mysterious sepulture of Moses, may also be seen in Sota, f. 22. 2. But, as a curious narrative is extracted from Rabboth, 302. f. c. 2. in Yalkut Simeoni, f. 404. col. 2. on this subject, it may not be amiss to transcribe the passage for the use of those who may not have access to it.

ומלאך סמאל ראש לכל הסטנים הוא בכל שעה היה מצפה מיתתו של משה ואמר מתי יגיע הרגע שבו ימות משה שארד ואטול נשמתו של משה הימנו עליו——בכל הסטנים כלם אין לך רשע בסמאל ואין לך צדיק בכל הנביאים כמשה——כך היה סמאל הרשע מצפה למיתתו של משה ואומר מתי יהא מיכאל בוכה ואני אמלא פי שחק עד שאמר לו מיכאל רשע אני בוכה ואתה משחק אל תשמחי אויבתי לי כי נפלתי קמתי נפגלתי במיתתו של משה וקמתי בפרנסתו של יהושע בשעה שהפיל שלשים ואחד מלכים כי אשב בחשך בחרבן בית ראשון ובית שני יהוה אור לי לימות המשיח:

"But the Angel Sammael, the Head of all the Satanim, was continually watching for the death of Moses, and said, how long will it "be, ere Moses die! that I may descend and pluck out his soul, &c. "..Of all the Satanim, there was none more wicked than Sammael, "and of all the Prophets, none more righteous than Moses. ..... "Thus Sammael the wicked was watching for the death of Moses, "and said, when it shall come to pass, that Michael shall weep, I "will fill my mouth with laughter, until Michael replied to him, Thou "wicked one, shall I weep? and shalt thou laugh? REJOICE NOT "OVER ME, O MINE ENEMY, BECAUSE I HAVE FALLEN, FOR I SHALL "ARISE! (Micah) I have fallen indeed at the death of Moses, but I "arose under the administration of Joshua, when he extirpated thirty-"one kings. I indeed sat in darkness (cf. Micah supra, vii. 8.) at "the destruction of the first temple, but in the second, Jehovah "shall be my Light, in the days of the Messiah." In the preceding page, Sammael is called מלאך המות the Angel of Death, and Moses is said on his approach to have pronounced the name יהוה, which wounded him dreadfully, &c. Accounts much to the same effect may also be collected from other Rabbinical works. Pantaleo, in his book on Michael's Miracles, says, τοῦτο δὲ ὁ Ἀποστολος

SECTION CLXX.

If now the originality of Jude be evident from the comparison of both authors, and especially from the language, we are authorized in all the inferences, which flow from thence.

Peter had in his second Epistle to the people of Asia Minor observed the same conduct as in the first. In this he took Paul for his guide, according to whose direction he planned and executed the instruction to these communities, with whom he was unacquainted; besides which he also made use of the Epistle of James: but in his second essay he adhered to the Epistle of Jude, who had already contended with these Heretics, to whom he would now also oppose his own authority.

The style of writing, likewise, is the same in the second Epistle of Peter, as in the first; the same mode of appropriating the conceptions and expres-

εὑρε γεγραμμενον εἰς ἀρχαῖον Ἑβραϊκον βιβλιον ἀποκρυφον· πολλα γαρ και χωρις τῶν ἐνδιαθηκων βιβλιων ἀνεγραφησαν· ἀλλα δια το οὐκ ἐκκλησιαζεσθαι αὐτα, ἐνοθευθησαν· ἐχουσι δε και τινα ὀνησιφορα.

We must, however, observe, that Μωσεως σωμα must be understood to mean Moses himself, not simply his body, because גוף is continually used in this sense, and was doubtless so accepted, when Jude wrote his Epistle. All the traditions, which we are able to compare with this passage, represent the contention to have related *not to his body*, but TO HIS FUTURE STATE, with which Jude harmonizes, if we imagine his expression to be a Hebraism. Some of these writers have supposed it to have arisen in consequence of his sin at Rephidim.

Michael's reproof is not wanting to complete the analogy: it is the common יגער יהוה בך השטן of the Rabbin: accordingly, Pantaleo interprets it, καταργησει σε, Διαβολε, ὁ Θεος.—*Translator.*

sions of others, of modifying them by some slight turns: of beautifying them occasionally, of embellishing them with participles, and amplifying them.

This similarity between the second Epistle of Peter and the first, does not merely consist in some synonymous phrases, such as a person could easily adopt and repeat, who made it his business to invent an Epistle in the name of another, but it extends to the plan and the secret arrangement of the composition, to the peculiarities in the execution, and to the adroitness in not rendering that conspicuous, which it was necessary from particular reasons and circumstances to borrow from other authors. This similarity, therefore, is not superficial, but it is characteristic, and is so deeply established, that it likewise points to the same author. Herein we again perfectly recognize Peter, and perceive that the second Epistle is authentic, that it proceeded from his Genius, and was formed into a treatise under his hands.

But now if the second of Peter be genuine, so must also that of Jude be: it must not only have indeed existed in the days of the Apostles, and when Peter wrote the former Epistle, but must likewise have proceeded from such a Teacher, as this Apostle thought worthy of selecting for his guide, when he was preparing himself to oppose the errors and people of those countries, which he had not seen himself, and which he only knew through others.

We may, therefore, be satisfied respecting the authenticity of these two writings from internal reasons, even if the historical proofs and testimonies of the ancients were less satisfactory.

SECTION CLXXI.

We find some passages in the earliest Fathers of the Church, which may be considered as quotations *memoriter* from the second Epistle of Peter, though their similarity is not perfectly verbal. I enumerate among these the passage in the second book of Theophilus to Autolycus, c. 9.: οἱ δε τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀνθρωποι και πνευματοφοροι πνευματος ἁγιου, και προφηται γενομενοι, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθεντες και σοφισθεντες ἐγενοντο θεοδιδακτοι, cf. 2 Pet. i. 20. Very similar is the passage in 2 Ep. 13. ὁ λογος αὐτοῦ φαινων ὡσπερ λυχνος ἐν οἰκηματι συνεχομενῳ, to 2 Pet. i. 19. ὁ λογος ὡς λυχνος φαινων ἐν αὐχμηρῳ τοπῳ.

The citation of Irenæus is more explicit[p]: quoniam dies Domini sicut mille anni— ἡ γαρ ἡμερα Κυριου ὡς χιλια ἐτη. The passage indeed as to its substance is also in another place in the Bible, Ps. lxxxix.; but with quite a different application and appearance: ὁτι χιλια ἐτη ἐν οφθαλμοις σου, ὡς ἡ ἡμερα ἡ χθες, ἡτις διηλθε. As it appears in Irenæus, it occurs, according to the expression and words, only in 2 Pet. iii. 8.

If this citation is identically the same as the passage in Peter, and taken from him, which can hardly be denied, we have the pleasure of finding a much more antient witness in favour of the Epistle; viz. Justin Martyr, who had before referred to the same passage[q]. Clemens Alexandrinus after him also frequently made use of it in his works.

[p] Iren. L. v. adv. Hæres. c. 23.
[q] Dialog. cum Tryph. c. 81.

The first, however, who speaks very definitively of the second Epistle of Peter, is Origen; yet he at the same time observes, that it is doubted [r]. Eusebius explains himself in a similar manner, namely, that this Epistle had not been transmitted to him as a writing of the first order (of those generally acknowledged) yet, because many found it useful, it was thought proper to make use of it equally with the other Books of the New Testament [s].

Jerome informs us of one of the objections, which was made against the Epistle. For, he says, that it was disputed to belong to Peter, because a difference in style between this and the first Epistle of this Apostle had been observed [t], an observation which is at all times uncertain and unstable in critical disquisitions, as long as it only rests upon mere opinion and artificial ideas, and is not extended to absolute knowledge, and referred to grounds of philosophical and positive Grammar.

If the Ecclesiastical Teachers had no other scruple but this, we shall easily satisfy ourselves respecting this difficulty from our previous remarks.

The most ancient Syriac version does not, at present, contain the Epistle, but Ephræm quotes it in his Syriac as well as in his Greek works [u].

In general, as we descend to the fourth century, it is treated by the Christian Teachers with the same respect as other Biblical writings, and every where noticed in the lists of the Canonical Books.

The historical testimonies, however, will not afford to us that satisfaction, which we might desire to possess on subjects of this nature; and

[r] Euseb. H. E. vi. 25.
[s] Euseb. H. E. iii. 3.
[t] Hieronym. Script. Eccles. voce Petrus.
[u] Opp. Syr. L. ii. p. 342. Opp. Græc. tom. ii. p. 387.

though we call to our assistance usage and the established possession from time out of memory, by virtue of which a place had been granted to this Epistle of old in the Biblical codex; we shall nevertheless find occasion for the aid of internal reasons, to give to us a positive decision as to the authenticity of this essay.

SECTION CLXXII.

The Epistle of Jude, notwithstanding its brevity, has considerable testimonies of antiquity in its favor. The Gnostic Teachers endeavoured to cite it in favor of their opinions, and explained the 8th verse in particular, in support of their extravagant theory with regard to morals. The Father of the Church, to whom we are indebted for this communication, in the introduction to the treatise on this sect, makes mention of their own writings, from which he derived his information, and consequently laboured from authentic sources [x].

Among the Orthodox of the Greek Church, Clemens Alexandrinus cites the Epistle, as the production of a prophetical spirit, under the name of Jude [y].

Origen calls the Epistle an essay replete with Hea-

[x] Epiphan. adv. Hær. L. i. T. ii. Hær. xxvi. Num. 13. Pet. a Ed. Basil. p. 45. Βουλονται γαρ την καθ' αὐτῶν μαρτυριαν τῶν ἀπο τῆς ἐπιστολης τοῦ Ἰουδα μᾶλλον εἰς αὐτους δηθεν ἐπαγεσθαι, ἐν τῳ λεγειν και οἱ μεν ἐνυπνιαζομενοι σαρκα μιαινοῦσι....., οὐκ εἶπε δε ὁ μακαριος Ἰουδας, ἀδελφος τοῦ Κυριου, περι ἐνυπνιαζομενων ἐν σωμασιν κ'.τ'.λ.

[y] L. iii. Strom. c. 2. p. 431. Sylb. ἐπι τουτῶν οἰμαι και των ὁμων αἱρεσεων προφητικως Ἰουδαν ἐν τῃ ἐπιστολῃ εἰρηκεναι. Cf. Ped. c. iii. c. 8.

venly Grace [a]. In the book περι ἀρχῶν he is even inclined to concede to the treatise, *Ascensio Mosis*, a demonstrating authority, upon the supposition, that Jude had quoted it in his Epistle [a]. In the meantime it appears from one of his assertions, that many of his cotemporaries were not of his opinion, and harboured some doubts respecting the authority of the Epistle. But Pamphilus, his scholar, the worthy Teacher of Eusebius, makes use of it without any scruple [b].

Nevertheless, Eusebius does not conceal from us, that the opinions of his predecessors had been divided on the subject, and that this writing was not to be reckoned among the generally acknowledged [c].

Such is likewise the case in the Syrian Church. Its version (the Peshito) does not contain the Epistle; but it appears, that this was not formerly the case, as Ephræm is acquainted with it, and does not hesitate in attributing to it the rank of a Biblical Book [d].

The most ancient catalogue among the Latins, which the anonymous author in Muratori has given, expressly mentions it among the acknowledged and received writings [e]. Tertullian in speaking of Enoch

[a] Comm. in Matt. xiii. p. 223. Ἰουδας ἐγραψεν ἐπιστολην ὀλιγοστιχον μεν, πεπληρωμενην δε των της ἐπουρανιου χαριτος λογων.

[a] L. iii. c. 2. De quo in Ascensione Moysi, cujus libelli meminit in Epistolâ suâ Judas, Michael Archangelus cùm Diabolo disputans de corpore Moysi, ait, à Diabolo inspiratum Serpentem causam extitisse prævaricationis Adæ, &c.

[b] Comment. in Matth. p. 488. v. iii. Ruæi, and Apolog. pro Orig. opp. Orig. vol. iv. p. 23.

[c] Euseb. H. E. L. iii. c. 25.

[d] Opp. Syr. T. i. p. 136. Hassencamp's Remarks upon the Introduction of Michaelis, p. 42-4.

[e] T. iii. Ant. i. p. 854.

refers to the Epistle of Jude, and affixes to the author the predicate, Apostle [f].

There were, however, subsequently, and perhaps also previously, some among the Latins, who refused to acknowledge this writing; but this made no impression upon the whole. In consequence of its antiquity and long use, it was, in the times of Jerome, considered equal to the other sacred writings [g].

The principal objection, that was urged against it, is, that it refers to an Apocryphal book, viz. to that of Enoch. For, as some on that account considered the book of Enoch [h], and the *Ascensio Mosis*, as authorized writings, so others adopted the contrary opinion, and denied the Apostolical dignity and inspiration to a writer, who encumbered himself with apocryphal writings. Thus Didymus

[f] De cultû fœm. c. 4. eo accedit, quod Enoch apud Judam Apostolum testimonium possidet.

[g] In Catal. V. Judas, tamen auctoritatem vetustate et usû meruit, et inter sanctas scripturas computatur.

[h] The passage, which Jude has quoted, is found in the second chapter of the book of Enoch, and exactly harmonizes with the Epistle. There is but little doubt that the Æthiopic copies, to which we are indebted for our knowledge of this work, are a translation of some Rabbinical treatise, which is probably no more. Bishop Lawrance, sometime since, translated the Bodleian copy into English, and De Sacy before him gave extracts from that in the Bibliotheque du Roi at Paris. It contains many phrases peculiar to the book of Daniel, and in the Bishop's opinion was written sometime after the Babylonian captivity, and not long before the advent of the Messiah. That it was a translation from a Jewish work, we may argue from Zohar, which has this passage, in which it is mentioned חנוך זה אתמשר שפרא דאקרי שפרא דחנוך. Rabbi Bechai (in Num. xxv. 12. fi. 182) like Jude, calls Enoch, שביעי לאדם ἑβδομος ἀπο Ἀδαμ, and R. Menahem, f. 83. 4., adds, that every seventh generation was holden in the greatest honour.—*Translator.*

of Alexandria, and Jerome, among the Latins, assure us [1].

SECTION CLXXIII.

Who was this Jude? If James the Brother of the Lord and James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle, are one and the same person, so also is Jude the Brother of the Lord and Jude in the list of the Apostles only one and the same person. But admitting even that there were two, to which Jude does the Epistle belong?

Our Jude calls himself [a] ἀδελφος Ἰακωβου̃, Brother of James. He either adopts this predicate to distinguish himself from the family and thereby to individualize his person to the reader; or he wished to name himself from James, a famed teacher of Christianity, for the sake of thereby heightening and strengthening his own authority.

He does not, however, thereby distinguish himself with regard to his extraction. Each James had a Brother of the name of Jude; or each Jude a Brother of the name of James, consequently we are in no wise better informed by the addition of the Brother's name, with regard to his family-relationship or to his person.

The other reason, why he added his Brother's name, might therefore be the true one. But in this case James the Apostle could give no weight nor recommendation to Jude the Apostle, which he did not already himself possess. We find nothing in the Biblical history, which made him known in remote

[1] Didym. apud. Fabric. Cod. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test. p. 846. Hieronym. in Catal. V. Judas.

[a] Cf. Euseb. H. E. iii. 20., and the preface.—*Translator.*

countries, and distinguished him above others, nothing but his name by the side of Jude's in the catalogue of the Apostles.

Let us substitute for it that of James the Brother of the Lord; HE was honoured as THE RIGHTEOUS AND THE WISE, and his name was known in many countries. The Preachers and Defenders of the Law had proclaimed him in Galatia, and made him known *in* Achaia; and by the means of the enactment in Jerusalem, on which occasion his voice had decided, his name was spread far and wide in Asia. Besides, he was revered in the eyes of all the converted Jews by the high station which he occupied, and by his ministerial character at Jerusalem; His lustre was reflected upon his Brother, and His dignity also procured to him peculiar reverence. In this case, Jude might well be anxious to place the name of his Brother by the side of his own, and thus to distinguish and signalize himself.

Jude, moreover, does not call himself an Apostle, yet it was necessary that he should announce by what right he thought proper to decide and prescribe respecting the Christian system. He calls himself, in the same manner as James, THE SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δουλος, which predicate must either have been more significant than that of Apostle, or he must have called himself an Apostle,—for the expression, SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST, in the sense in which it belongs to all reverers of Christianity, ensured to him no more Doctrinal Authority, than to the most common among the Christians. But if it be used in a more præ-eminent sense, it can only denote a nearer relation to Jesus, than that which is merely Apostolical.

Clemens in his Stromata, therefore, rightly judged, when he observes, that Jude, who wrote the Catholic

Epistle, one of the sons of Joseph, a pious man, although he was well aware of his relationship to the Lord, nevertheless did not call himself his Brother, but said, JUDE THE SERVANT OF JESUS CHRIST, (viz. of the Lord), AND THE BROTHER OF JAMES [m].

SECTION CLXXIV.

WE should now also become acquainted with the Heretics, against whom Peter and Jude composed their two Epistles. They denied that, which the two Apostles laid principally to their charge, viz. our Lord; yet they were members of the Christian Faith, and joined in the assemblies of its Professors, Jude 12. This denial cannot, therefore, be understood, as if they had entirely separated themselves from the Discipleship of Jesus and from his school; but, according to the letter and expressions of the accusations, which were made against them, they refused only to acknowledge Jesus as Δεσποτην; τον ἀγορασαντα αὐτους, Δεσποτην ἀρνουμενοι, 2 Pet. ii. 1. και τον μονον Δεσποτην, και Κυριον ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦν Χριστον ἀρνουμενοι, Jude 4. For they denied, that He was the Creator or the Ruler and Judge of the World, or all this together; like some, who had before denied, that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of God,— ἀρνουμενοι, ὁτι Ἰησους ἐστιν ὁ Χριστος, κ. τ. λ. They must certainly have disputed his Government of the World and his Office as Judge, 2 Pet. iii. 4—12.; as they are even referred to the Book of Enoch,

[m] Judas, qui Catholicam scripsit Epistolam, frater filiorum Joseph, extans valde religiosus, cum sciret propinquitatem Domini, non tamen dixit, se ipsum ejus Fratrem esse; sed quid dixit? JUDAS SERVUS CHRISTI, utpote Domini, FRATER AUTEM JACOBI. Opp. Clem. T. ii. p. 1007. Ed. Venet.

which already had long since announced this his Judicial Character [n], Jude 14.

They had moreover brought into circulation ideas respecting the spiritual world, which were very erroneous, and incompatible with its Dignity. The names, by which the Spirits are here designated, are δοξαι and κυριοτητες; the latter expression is occasionally used by Paul in speaking of the different classes of Spirits, as the Theurgical Teachers of Asia Minor had distinguished them according to their rank, Ephes. i. 21., Coloss. i. 16.

However great their theoretical errors might be, yet they were to be accounted insignificant in comparison of the excesses, to which they abandoned themselves, and which were no longer confined within the bounds of natural depravity. To which we may also add a reckless love of gain, to which nothing was too dear or too sacred not to be sacrificed.

But the description of these Heretics and Heresies, is, as we perceive, not given with any thing like that circumstantiality, which is requisite to enable

[n] This manifestly appears to have been the reason, why Jude cited Apocryphal works in his Epistle, viz. for the sake of refuting their own assertions from those productions, which like the rest of their nation they most probably respected. For this purpose the book of Enoch was peculiarly calculated, since in the midst of all its ineptiæ and absurdities, this point and the orders of the spiritual world are strongly urged and discussed in it. It is irrelevant to the inquiry, how much of the present book existed at this time, for that it was framed by different writers and at different periods no critic can deny; yet that this was the leading character of the work, and that these were the prominent dogmata of those parts, which were then in existence, we have every presumptive evidence. The Hebrew names of Angels, &c. such as the Ophanim, plainly indicate it to have been a translation from some lost Jewish original, which was doubtless known both to Peter and to Jude; nor can the unprejudiced examiner of these Epistles well hesitate to acknowledge Hug's explanation of them to be the most correct and the most reasonable.—*Translator.*

us instantly to recognize and firmly fix upon those among the many, to whom it is applicable. They were apparently a branch of that Theurgical and Magical Philosophy, the system of which we have before described, which was strikingly distinguished by its Pneumatological speculations upon the Angels and the spiritual state, and by the inferences which resulted from thence.

As long as we stop at this general assertion, we shall probably not meet with many contradictions. But some imagine from hence the school of the Nicolaitans to have already been in its full perfection, which is neither improbable nor incompatible with the assertions of both the Apostles, as far as we have any authenticated knowledge of this sect. This investigation, however, if it should be undertaken with critical industry, would lead to much prolixity and accessory discussions, for which the materials are not properly prepared, and for which also this is not the place °.

° The arguments of those, who decide them to have been the Nicolaitans, according to my opinion, are at present the following:— John in the Apocalypse describes the Nicolaitans nearly as the Heretics are here represented to us, with the same comparison, and with the same vices; persons, who exercise the arts of Balaam, who taught Balak to ensnare the children of Israel, and to induce them to partake of idolatrous sacrifices and to fornicate, Acts ii. 14., Jude 2., 2 Pet. ii. 15. Even בלעם, according to its derivation, is equivalent to Νικολαος. They also certainly denied the Lord's creation and Government of the World. Alterum quidem fabricatorem, alium autem Patrem Domini....et eam conditionem, quæ est secundum nos, non à primo Deo factam, sed à Virtute aliquâ valde deorsum subjectâ. Iren. L. iii. c. 11. If now all corporeal and material existence has its origin from the Creator of the World, who is a very imperfect and gross spirit, it flows naturally from this notion, that they could not admit a corporeal resuscitation by the agency of the Supreme Being, or by the agency of Jesus, in an universal day of judgment. With respect to the Spiritual World, they also actually taught such absurdities, that it must be said of them,

SECTION CLXXV.

The strange phænomenon in the Epistle of Jude, in assigning a demonstrating authority to the book of Enoch, has led the ancients and moderns to a very great contrast of decisions and conclusions, sometimes to the prejudice of the Epistle, and sometimes in favour of the book of Enoch. The same

δοξας βλασφημοῦσι; for they supposed, Æones quosdam turpitudinis natos; et complexus, et permixtiones execrabiles, et obscænas. Tertullianus in append. ad Lib. de præscript. c. 46. But, as to their excesses and abominable mode of life, the accounts of the ancients are so unanimous, and the accusations are so constituted, that the two Apostolic Epistles may have most pertinently referred to them.

The analogy, which Hug notices between בלעם and Νικολαος, however ingenious, is encumbered with too much difficulty to be admitted. All that we know of Balaam beyond the inspired narrative, is a farrago of fable, nor do we know much more of the Nicolaitans. The Fathers vary from each other respecting them, and detail little more than legends. They are only mentioned twice in the New Testament, and have falsely been said to have been founded by Nicolaus, one of the six Deacons who were consecrated with Stephen. They doubtless were a branch of Gnostics, whose peculiar theories and propensities are described in Irenæus and others. Their origin must necessarily remain uncertain; but it is evident from the mention made of Balaam, that in each passage the language is symbolical, and that the allusion is to the similarity of turpitude between those, to whom the Apostles wrote, and those who more immediately bore this name. Eichhorn seems inclined to confound them with the Bileamites, but Apoc. ii. 14. and 15. establishes a sufficient distinction between them. To this he is induced by the assumed identity of name;—for he conceives בלע to be synonymous with بلغ, which (to make no observation on the dissimilar radicals) the slightest examination of his Lexicon would have disproved, and exhibited بلع to have been the corresponding word.—*Translator.*

thing, which happened partly to this Epistle, happened also to the second of Peter, on account of the dispute of the Arch-Angel with Satan about the body of Moses, which they cite as an example and as an admonition. The more unbiassed judges of this matter considered the two displays of learning or arguments, as they should be considered, as mere fables, and their decision consequently turned usually against the Epistles.

The book of Enoch, in fact, was full of Jewish, Theurgical, and Magical reveries, as indeed the character of the person, to whom this writing was ascribed, required it to be. According to Eupolemus he is said to have been the inventor of Astrology, or rather a scholar of the Angels in this science, who initiated him into the mysteries of it[p]; for he had at one time obtained a mission to the Angels[q], on which occasion he probably received their instruction. But it did not suffice, that he was acquainted with the course of the planets, the position of the Heavens, and their signification; but he likewise, as the Jews and other Easterns maintained, learned in addition from the Heavenly Natures, the art of prognostication, characters, offerings, purifications, lustrations, and other things of this description, which he imparted to mankind[r]. According to these ideas, which were entertained of him far and wide among Jews, Arabians, and others, we can easily determine, to what sort of literature his writings must belong. The remains of it, which we find in the Church-Fathers also, do not deceive this expectation.

[p] Apud Euseb. de Præp. Ev. L. ix. c. 17. p. 419. Edit. Vigeri.

[q] Irenæus, L. iv. adv. Hær. c. 16.

[r] Abulpharagii Hist. Dynast. i. p. 9, 10. Arabic Text. Upon this subject more has been collected by Kircher in his Obeliscus Pamphilius, L. i. c. 3. Wetstein in Judam 14. in his N. T.

The greater fragments in Syncellus inform us respecting the names of the superior Angels, respecting other Spirits and Genii, and their different offices [t]. We are referred to the same subjects by the earlier intimations and notices respecting the contents of this work. It has furnished us, (says Tertullian) with a gradation of the Spirits; in another place he has extracted from thence warnings against the seductions of evil Dæmons and [t] fallen Beings. According to the Book of Enoch, these were the Angels who brought to light the secret power of plants and hidden operations of nature and its riches, and the more precious metals, and who endowed mankind with sciences of this description [u]. These were those, who, (as Clemens Alexandrinus assures us from the book of Enoch), brought down to us the knowledge of the constellations, the art of prognostication and other useful sciences [x].

To this all the more ancient intimations respecting this Book or its fabled author invariably lead us. This was nearly the idea, which was formed of the

[t] Syncelli Chronogr. p. 11. f. 24. f. Edit. Goar. Grabe Spic. Patrum, T. i. p. 347.

[u] Jude 6., where mention of the fallen angels is made, seems also to be an allusion to the book of Enoch. In the 7th Ch. § 7. of it, this circumstance is described, the names of the Angelic Leaders are given, and Mount Armon is stated to have been the place, where they ratified their covenant. Failing in their attempt, they were hurled into darkness, laden with chains beneath the earth, until the day of the last judgment, on the arrival of which they will be tortured in the fire for ever.

Such is the account of this book, which is wonderfully similar to that of Jude. Hug evidently was not acquainted with it, but derived his information from Clemens Alexandrinus and other sources. Its Æthiopic title is መጽሐፈ: ሄኖክ: ዘዐቢይ::—*Translator.*

[x] Tertull. de habitû mulier. c. 3. de Idolat. c. 4. et 15. de cultû fœminar. c. 10.

[t] Ex script. Prophetar. Eclogæ. c. liii. p. 1002. Ed. Venet.

work and of the genius of the author[y]. But all this corroborates the assertion, that those magical and Theurgic opponents, about whom we have before made our remarks, were the persons, whom Jude wished to oppose.

The adventure likewise between Michael and the Devil about the body of Moses, which the ancients read in the ἀναβασις Μωϋσεως, may have originated in the claims, which the Evil Being maintained to the matter and the body, or in some other cause [z]; the idea of a contest between the good and evil natures of the spiritual state, which again leads us back to Theurgical systems and Teachers, is directly and sufficiently contained in it.

Wherefore now, did the Apostles quote these books—these examples and proofs? Naturally—for the sake of explaining to those, against whom they wrote, their errors and criminality. Proofs and contradictions from the authentic Scriptures would have been of no avail against them, for they evaded them, as Peter expressly complains against them, iii. 16, by means of their perversions and their forced explanations, τας γραφας στρεβλουσιν. Consequently, there existed no surer way to correct them than by adducing those writings, which they valued as the sources of their particular views and assertions; by nothing could they be more effectually silenced and confounded in the presence of their cotemporaries, than by opposing to them those arguments, on which

[y] Grabe Spicileg. S. S. P. P. Tom. i. p. 344—58. Fabricii Cod. Apocr. Vet. Test. P. i. p. 160—224. P. ii. 55—60. Scaliger ad Euseb. Chronic. p. 244. Concerning an Ethiopic Book of Enoch, see Michaelis' Oriental Library, 6th P. 224.

[z] Fabricii Cod. Apocr. V. T. P. i. p. 402. and 840—48. Scholia in Epist. Jud. p. 238, 39. Edit. Nov. Test. C. F. Matthæi.

they plumed themselves. This observation will not only excuse our Apostles, but will convince us, that in this situation, with these adversaries, they could have done nothing more suitable, nothing more considerate, than even that, on account of which some have censured and doubted their two Epistles.

THE APOCALYPSEOF SAINT JOHN.

SECTION CLXXVI.

The author calls himself John, and mentions the Isle of Patmos as the place, where he saw these Revelations. We will not long delay to investigate which John the testimony of antiquity recognizes as the author. But, first we would merely say a few words respecting the place, in which these visions were revealed to him. For the question has been proposed, whether in this, which is entirely a poetical work, the statement of the situation, in which the author places himself, claims historical credit.

The case is not singular; and if other examples of antiquity are proportionate, the answer is at hand. No one yet has deemed what Hesiod has said of his birth place, and his settlement in Bœotia in the Poem of the Weeks and Days, v. 630—638, to be untrue. Should we account what Ovid has mentioned relative to his banishment to Tomos, what Phædrus the Fabulist, and Martial the Epigrammatist have mentioned respecting the circumstances of their lives,

as fictions, because they are mentioned in poetry? But to ascend from profane to sacred, have we a scruple respecting Ezekiel's account in the beginning of his prophecies? "*It came to pass in the 30th year, when I was on the river Chabor,*" &c. Do we not give any credit to the accounts respecting Jeremiah's condition of life, which he has scattered here and there in his prophecies? If we believe the travels of Hesiod; Ezekiel's transplantation to the Chabor; Ovid's exile; is the case indeed different with John and his Banishment?

Let us suppose the author to have intended here to be poetical; what reason would he have to place himself in his poetical flight upon a rock almost unmentioned by the ancients, which has only become celebrated through the Apocalypse? Why did he not select a picturesque theatre for his trances? or a situation renowned on account of ancient revelations, and consecrated by some great recollection or another? Had this been the case, some ground would exist for the question; "what proportion of fiction or truth is there in it?" If we consult his words, we find nothing in them but unequivocal and faithful prose; "*I John, who also am your Brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, was in the Isle called Patmos, for the word of God and for the testimony of Jesus.*" This indeed he says to us, before any mental flight has taken place. Having concluded this declaration, he then begins ἐγενομην ἐν πνευματι, I was in the spirit, i. 10. In every respect the contrary is proved, and no further doubts can detain us from examining the testimonies, as to the John, who is the author.

Some, who were acquainted with John the Evangelist by sight, have informed us (relative to a doubt-

ful reading in the Apocalypse,—*e. g.* the number of the beast in xiii. 18.) that * the number 666 must

* Omnibus antiquis et probatissimis et veteribus Scripturis numero hôc posito, et testimonium perhibentibus his, qui facie ad faciem Joannem viderunt, και μαρτυροῦντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τον Ἰωαννην ἑωρακοτων····quoniam numerus nominis Bestiæ, secundum Græcorum computationem, per litteras, quæ in eo sunt, sexcentos habet et sexaginta sex. Irenæus L. v. adv. Hær. c. 30. Euseb. H. E. L. iv. c. 24.

This passage alone will prove the author of the Apocalypse to have been well versed in the Rabbinical, if not the Cabbalistical writings of this day. The very commencement of the verse ὧδε ἡ σοφια ἐστιν—is analogous to the Jewish Cabbalistical style, when the writer is about to enter upon some abstruse or Gematrical inquiry—*e. g.* והם סתרי כ״ע וחכמה. "*These* are the arcana *of the Chether* Aliun and Wisdom." The Asiatics anciently were accustomed to use the alphabetical letters as numeral signs, and they still frequently adhere to the practice; the Greeks also, as it is well known, did the same, and examples may be found in the Greek Anthology, which correspond to the present instance. That the Christian writers also were addicted to this practice, we have proofs in the pages of the Fathers, and of the Byzantine writers; thus, the anonymous writer cited by Cotelerius says, ἰσεον, ὁτι το Μωϋσης ὀνομα ψηφιζομενον ἐχει ἀριθμον ϙχμή, και εὑρεθη ὁ Μωσαϊκος νομος κρατησας τοσαῦτα ἐτη. He then proceeds to similar calculations on the name of Christ and the word ϛαυρος, in which he is corroborated by another Codex. Irenæus also trifles in the same way περι συντελειας. Cotelerius reduçes these labores ineptiarum into the following compendium, "Μωϋσης valet, ϙχμή MDCXLVII=μ'—XL—ϡ—DCCC—υ. cccc—σ'—cc—η—VIII—ϛ—cc. Χριτος ϙυπ', MCCCCLXXX=χ'—DC—ρ'—c—ι—x—σ'—cc—τ'—ccc—ο'—LXX—ϛ'—cc. ϛαυρος, ϙσσά, MCCLXXI=σ'—cc—τ'—ccc—α'—I—υ'—cccc—ρ'—c—ο'—LXX—ϛ'—cc." Paul seems likewise to have noticed these speculations, when he argued from God resting on the seventh day, that a Sabbatism, was prepared for the people of God:—for, the Jews from time immemorial seem to have been impressed with the idea, that as the world was created in six days, it would endure six thousand years, and that as God rested on the seventh day, then a millenary of rest (or according to others, an eternal Sabbatism) would be conceded to mankind.

be read; as this number was even found in those copies, which were called ancient in the second century. To whom the ancient MSS. in their superscriptions have ascribed the Book, according to these

Hence, without the adduction of more examples, we perceive this to have been a national custom, and common to all the neighbouring Eastern countries. Irenæus says, that John stated Λατεῖνος to have been the name intended,

Λ	— 30
α	— 1
τ	— 300
ε	— 5
ι	— 10
ν	— 50
ο	— 70
ς	— 200
	666

An infinity of others have been also proposed, among which the most ancient, and perhaps the most absurd are

E— 5	T—300	α— 1	Λ— 30	'O— 70	K— 20
ν—400	ε— 5	ρ—100	α— 1	N— 50	α— 1
α— 1	ι— 10	ν— 50	μ— 40	ι— 10	κ— 20
ν— 50	τ—300	ο— 70	π— 80	κ— 20	ο— 70
ϑ— 9	α— 1	ν—400	ε— 5	η— 8	ς —200
α— 1	ν— 50	μ— 40	τ—300	τ—300	ὁ— 70
ς —200		ε— 5	ι— 10	η— 8	δ— 4
	666		ς —220	ς —200*	η— 8
666		666			γ— 3
			666	666	ο— 70
					ς —200
					666

In Titan an ε has been inserted for the purpose, but although Λατεῖνος is now written without the ε, it certainly had it originally: yet whether it had it when the Apocalypse was written, may reasonably be disputed. Cf. Iren. L. v. c. xxix. 2. &c. 30. concerning the orthography of Λατεῖνος. Bishop Newton argued from the occurrence of Hebrew names in the Apocalypse, such as Abaddon and

assertions, we would not take into consideration. But if cotemporaries mention an individual, as the

Armageddon, that this was probably one in that language, and therefore proposed רומיית.

ר	— 200
ו	— 6
מ	— 40
י	— 10
י	— 10
ת	— 400
	666

but this is encumbered with too many objections to be admissible, even if such a word were found.

St. John was certainly not speaking of an individual, but of an Empire, consequently the preceding are inapplicable to the solution of the question, and the latter falls under this remark, because the substantive, which should complete the allusion, is not expressed. The most ingenious, and the only one which is not subject to these animadversions, is one recently suggested by Dr. Adam Clarke. It is—

Ἡ	— 8
Λ	— 30
α	— 1
τ	— 300
ι	— 10
ν	— 50
η	— 8
β	— 2
α	— 1
σ	— 200
ι	— 10
λ	— 30
ε	— 5
ι	— 10
α	— 1
	666

The arguments adduced by those, who urge a man's name to have been here intended, rest on the words ἀριθμος γαρ ἀνθρωπου

But not one of the interpreters of this passage, who have pro-

author of a writing, this is a strong testimony; and it is still stronger, if even acquaintances of an author do this, and are able to say, what the author wrote in a remarkable passage, in which the copies were at variance.

Nothing also could be objected against this, if the person, through whom this account has been transmitted to us, had not too carelessly in a similar case resigned himself to the persuasions of witnesses, on whom no dependence can be placed. There were some of the Gnostic school, who maintained that the Lord, after having lived thirty years in retirement, had only taught during one year, and that then he died. He remarked, very correctly, against them, that after the baptism three Passovers occur in the Gospel during his ministry, which certainly amount to more than one year. But he then continues, that "Jesus was more than thirty years old—and even verging to forty and fifty," and refers, not only with respect to the first position, but likewise in support

duced *the name of a man*, have confined its meaning to *an individual*: yet, if the interpretation of the name be so restricted, that of the whole verse and prophecy must necessarily be so likewise: otherwise a part will be inconsistent with the whole. It is far more probable, that ἀριθμος ἀνθρωπου refers to the mode of computation then in common use among men (of which we have produced examples, and might produce many more) which was applied not merely to names but to words, as we perceive in the Cabbala Denudata, and the writings of the Jews. Thus Aben Ezra and David Kimchi mention this process, as that by which the Jews conceived the Messiah to have been intended by the title צמח—viz. because it was equivalent in numbers to מנחם or the Comforter, and Reuchlin has adduced other instances from the Targum of Jonathan, which shew the ancient and most extended nature of the practice. There is, therefore, but little doubt, that here the סכנתא was intended: and, probably, the Apostle resorted to this method of expressing his meaning, from fear of injuring Christianity, by giving umbrage to the Roman Power.—*Translator.*

of the additional years, to the testimony of those, who had lived and associated with John [b].

He has probably here trusted too much to Papias, who compiled indiscriminately, without regard to truth and falsehood, all that he heard respecting men of the Apostolic age, who, therefore, only with the greatest caution, deserved any credit in questions of this nature.

After the cotemporaries of the Apostles, Papias himself is next in order. His writings, except a few fragments, are lost; but the commentators include him among the decided witnesses in favour of the Apocalypse; particularly Andreas of Cappadocia, who was possessed of several monuments and writings respecting the Apocalypse now lost [c].

The statement of the Cappadocian Bishop has indeed been attempted to be rendered suspected, because he also mentions Gregorius Theologus among the friends of the Apocalypse, of which nothing appears in his works. But the precipitate nature of this accusation is evident [d], so that it causes no farther obstacle. Besides, whoever is acquainted with the attachment of Irenæus to Papias, will hardly be persuaded that the former would have decided so positively concerning this book, if the latter had been of a different opinion.

[b] Irenæus, L. ii. adv. Hær. c. 22. n. 5. Παντες οἱ πρεσβυτεροι μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ κατα την Ἀσιην Ἰωαννῃ τῷ τοῦ Κυριοῦ μαθητῃ συμβεβληκοτες, παραδεδωκεναι ταῦτα Ἰωαννην.

[c] Περι μεντοι τοῦ Θεοπνευστοῦ τῆς βιβλου περιττον μηκυνειν τον λογον ἡγοῦμεθα, τῶν Μακαριων, Γρηγοριου φημι, τοῦ Θεολογου, και Κυριλλου, προσετι δε και τῶν ἀρχαιοτερων, Παππιου, Εἰρηναιου, Μεθοδιου, και Ἱππολιτου ταυτῃ προσμαρτυροῦντων το ἀξιοπιστον. Andr. Prol. in Apoc. inter Opp. Chrysost in Nov. Test. Tom. ii. Frontoduc. Francof. p. 175.

[d] Christ. Fried. Schmid. Is the Revelation of John an inspired Book? Leipsig 1177. p. 352, and Histor. Canon. L. ii. P. i. Sect. 4. § 166.

Justin Martyr is an illustrious voucher for the Apocalypse: he ascribes it to *John, one of the Apostles of the Lord*[e]. Afterwards also came Theophilus Antiochenus, who, particularly in the book against Hermogenes, has taken proofs and evidences from it[f].

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, President of one of the seven Churches, to which the Apocalypse contains an Epistle and particular charges, composed an entire work upon it. Eusebius thus expresses himself respecting his literary labours, Μελιτωνος, και τα περι του Διαβολου, και της Αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννου, L. iv. c. 26. H. E. From these words Semler wished to persuade us, that the Book relative to the Devil and that relative to the Apocalypse are only one, and then made such conclusions from it as he chose. Yet, not to say any thing of the fact, that Eusebius, if Melito had controverted it, would not have passed over so important a circumstance, EVEN HE calls it the Apocalypse of John. But Jerome distinctly separates the two writings in his literary history, *voc. Melito, de Diabolo librum unum, de Apocalypsi Johannis librum unum.*

Bordering upon the limits of the 2nd and 3rd century, we meet with Apollonius, a learned Presbyter of the Church at Ephesus, who bears a testimony in favour of the Apocalypse[g]. He was on that spot, whence the contradiction must first have been heard, if it had been attempted to ascribe to the Apostle a work, which bore his great name without a title and claim. Ephesus prided itself on being the resi-

[e] Dial. cum Tryph. c. lxxxi. p. 308. Steph. Ιωαννης εἷς των Αποστολων Χριστου, εν Αποκαλυψει γενομενη αὐτῳ.

[f] Euseb. H. E. l. iv. c. 24.

[g] Euseb. H. E. l. v. c. 18. Κεχρηται δε και μαρτυριαις απο της Ιωαννου αποκαλυψεως, και νεκρον δε δυναμει θεια προς αὐτου Ιωαννου εν τῃ Εφεσῳ εγηγερθαι ἱστορει, κ. τ. λ.

dence of this cherished teacher, and on his instructions: it contained his ashes, and after him his scholars in the Presbytery. Besides this, the Apocalypse contains an express Epistle to this community, which entitles it to an eminent share in the book, and may be regarded as a dedication.

About the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century, Methodius, Bishop of Olympus, in Lycia, and afterwards at Tyre, appears as a witness. We still possess extracts from his commentaries on the Apocalypse in Andreas of Cappadocia. Photius has given to us the plan of some of his works, in which he has occasionally referred by name to the Apocalypse of St. John [h].

In the fourth century Ephræm Syrus is particularly worthy of notice among the Asiatics, who ascribes the Apocalypse to John, and indeed to John the Theologian [i].

But from this time a different opinion is perceived among the Bishops of Asia, the causes and motives of which must be illustrated by other occurrences, which we shall hereafter examine.

We shall now leave this part of the world, and turn to Africa, for the sake of following thither the fate of the Apocalypse. Here also its first reception was not less brilliant than in Asia. Clemens Alexandrinus considered its declarations as illustrious and gracious communications of the Apostolical voice, and itself as a work of John [k].

[h] Photius, Cod. 234. p. 489. Hoeschel, και ὁ μακαριος Ἰωαννης .... ἐδωκεν ἡ θαλασση τους νεκρους ἐν αὐτῃ .... κ`. τ`. λ`. Cod. 237. p. 508. ὁτι τα πλειστα τῆς τοῦ ἁγιοῦ Ἰωαννοῦ Ἀποκαλυψεως ῥητα εἰς την ἐκκλησιαν και τας παρθενουσας ψυχας ἀναγει.

[i] Opp. Syr. T. ii. p. 332. T. iii. p. 636. Opp. Græc. T. ii. p. 252. καθως και Ἰωαννης ὁ Θεολογος ἐκηρυξε. Cf. T. iii. p. 52. Hassencamp's Observations upon Michaelis's Introduct. p. 9. 13.

[k] το περιοπτον της Ἀποστολικης φωνης αἰνιττεσθαι χαριτος. Pædag. l. ii. c. 12. Strom. l. vi. c. 13. *alibi.*

Further towards the western part of Africa, Tertullian speaks in favour of it with determined confidence. Let any one (he says) examine through the whole succession of Bishops, from the present time up to John himself, and every one to the very last will declare John to have been the author [l].

Origen accounted it as a work of John the Evangelist; and, although, with regard to the 2nd and 3rd of his Epistles, and also with regard to the other Catholic Epistles (for instance the Epistle of Jude, which Origen considered inspired) he continually mentions the doubts which were at that time raised against them,—yet, he is no where conscious of a controversy with respect to the Apocalypse [m].

About this time it happened, that Nepos, Bishop of the Arsinoitical Præfecture, attacked the allegorical explanations of the Bible, and indeed with pointed reference to the Apocalypse, from the verbal interpretation of which he promised to himself the assertion of the Millenium, to which he was inclined. The Apocalypse was consequently at that time not reckoned among those writings, whose uncertain authority renders them unfit for the establishment of a doctrinal position: for he peculiarly founded his assertions upon it [n].

Hitherto all was favorable to the Apocalypse; but the doctrines of Nepos excited curiosity, and his

[l] L. iv. adv. Marcion. c. 5. Habemus et Joannis Alumnas Ecclesias. Nam etsi Apocalypsin ejus Marcion respuit, ordo tamen Episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Joannem stabit auctorem.

[m] Euseb. H. E. l. vi. c. 25. We find detached passages from Origen in Schmid's "Is the Revelation of John an inspired book?" p. 257 to 275.

[n] δοξας γουν ουτος εκ της Αποκαλυψεως Ιωαννου την ιδιαν κρατυνειν υπολημψιν, ελεγχον αλληγοριστων, λογον τινα περι τουτο συνταξας, επεγραψεν. Euseb. H. E. l. vii. c. 24.

writing (ἐλεγχος ἀλληγοριστῶν) obtained followers, who became so numerous, that several Churches were divided into two factions. A certain Koracion, after the death of Nepos, adopted his assertions, and vigorously defended the reign of a thousand years.

At the time when the disputes had become openly violent, Dionysius occupied the Alexandrian chair. He instituted a *Colloquium*, which is perhaps the only one, which ended in universal satisfaction. He gave an account of this, in a work which he entitled περι ἐπαγγελιῶν, *on the promises*, — in which he particularly endeavoured to render the Apocalypse, the main pillar of the doctrines of Nepos, useless. But he did it with great moderation, not to offend those, who with so much concession had acceded to a reconciliation.

Amidst these commotions on account of the Millenium, the first manifest and historically substantiated contradiction to the Apocalypse took place, which Eusebius relates in the very words of Dionysius, in extracts taken from the work on *the promises*. Since the venerable president of the Alexandrian Church has entered upon a critical investigation of the Apocalypse, so may we here, more than any where else, expect something worthy of being extracted upon the subject.

Dionysius first refers to earlier Teachers, τινες μεν οὐν των προ ἡμῶν, who had rejected the Revelations. "They maintained," he says, "that the title was false: that not only no Apostle, nor even a holy man, but Cerinthus wrote it. They went through it, chapter by chapter, for the sake of proving, that it was a writing without sense and connexion; a thing, nobody knows what, behind a dense veil of incomprehensibility:—that Cerinthus composed it for the sake of procuring authority for his Heresies

by means of an Apostolic name; for it teaches, like himself, an earthly reign of Christ amidst banqueting and sensual enjoyments."

Who now are these earlier Teachers? He does not use the expression, ἀρχαιοι ἀνδρες, or οἱ ἀπ' ἀνεκαθεν πρεσβυτεροι, *the ancients—those from the beginning—those of antiquity;* but he merely says, *some of our predecessors:* τινες τῶν προ ἡμῶν. These words in a proper and ordinary signification refer to no higher antiquity, and no farther back than to the preceding generation. The circumstance of Origen not being aware of any contradiction respecting this book, which he never forgot to mention respecting any of the doubted books, and the confidence, with which Nepos founds his dogmata and his favorite opinions upon it, do not allow us to suppose any more ancient opponents, than those whom Nepos, by means of the Millenium, had attracted to the Book in the heat of Party-Spirit.

The *status quæstionis* is therefore remarkable, as they have put it. They do not dispute the antiquity of the Book itself, but they rather admit, that it had descended from the days of the Apostles, and attribute it to an author cotemporary with John. According to their view, the question was exclusively this; was this book written by John the Apostle, or by his adversary, Cerinthus the Heretic? They decided in favour of the latter[*], and hoped to prove it

[*] Notwithstanding the ancient and modern controversies on the subject, the Book contains internal evidence, that it was written by John the Apostle. Hug has satisfactorily explained the perceptible difference of style observed between this and his other writings, as being the natural result of his subject, and of the Oriental imagery, with which he has embellished it. Wetstein has collated, however, passages in the Apocalypse with others in his Gospel and Epistles, from whence he seeks to elicit an analogy of expression, which

from the similarity between the doctrinal opinions of Cerinthus and the Apocalypse. For he has, ac-

will determine John to have been the author. They are the following :—cf.

Rev. i. 1.	with John xii. 33. xviii. 37. xxi. 19.
5.	1 John i. 7.
7.	John xix. 37.
9.	1 John v. 10.
ii. 10.	John xx. 27.
17.	John vi. 32.
iii. 4.	John vi. 66.
7. 9.	John xv. 20. xvii. 6. 1 John ii. 5.
9.	John xi. 27.
10.	John xii. 27.
21.	1 John ii. 13, 14. iv. 4. v. 5,
vi. 12.	John i. 29.
ix. 5.	John xviii. 26. iii. 17.
xii. 9.	John xii. 31.
xix. 13.	John i. 1.
xxi. 6.	John vii. 37.
xxii. 8. 10.	John viii. 51, 52. 55. xiv. 23, 24.

Several of these are too short and inconsequential, to authorize the establishment of any argument upon them, either in substantiation or refutation of the opinion, which we maintain : yet others are sufficiently determinate, to enable us to recognize the Apostle's ordinary style amidst the more splendid envelopments of this treatise.

Wetstein's idea, that the Apocalypse is a prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem, of the horrors of the Jewish war, and the civil wars of the Romans, is too forced in many of its parts to be fully admissible. Hug's idea which combines those parts of Wetstein's proposition, which seem to be demonstrated, with the opinions of those, who refer it to the persecutions of the Christians under the Roman Emperors, to the subjugation and dismemberment of Rome, and the subsequent happy days of the Church, is perhaps the most correct. This solusion appears most naturally to arise from the Apostle's circumstances and the existing state of things : it was the belief of the primitive Fathers in general : it is the most critically supported by the scope and contents of the book. The more commonly received theories of Bishop Newton, Faber, and others, who have conceived it to have been prophetical of the Papal power, are too liable to ob-

cording to his sensual mode of thinking, (they say) dreamed of an earthly reign of Christ, in which they will rejoice in banquets, gluttony, and other gross enjoyments, as the Apocalypse teaches.

jections; for, as Dr. A. Clarke sensibly remarks, "almost every commentator has become a *prophet;* for, as soon as he began to explain, he began also to *prophesy*."—The more remote and the more improbable have in these expositions been accepted into the place of the more proximate and probable: that which was passing under the eyes of the Apostle, with which he *must have been* acquainted, has been neglected for that, which he *might have* known by Revelation, but which it no where appears from the critical analysis of the book that he *did* know.

From the corresponding examples in the Jewish and other writings, which we have adduced on § 177. it is clear, that the Apostle not only cited prophetic passages, and formed his style in a great degree upon them, but also, that he alluded, as much as possible, to Jewish opinions, traditions, and phraseology. Hence, the glosses and interpretations which were annexed to these, could, as in the instance of the Millenium, have been easily forced on the words of the Apocalypse in the analogous passages, by those Heresiarchs, who were desirous of proving their theories by this work. Consequently, Cerinthus could have found but little difficulty in straining detached parts to the support of his dogmata; and from this presumed and forced coincidence, it doubtless arose, that his sect in subsequent times referred the composition of the Book to him. But John's claims are too well supported, and these citations too fully solve the origin of this assertion, for any importance to be attached to such ill-authenticated traditions. Hypothesis, indeed, must necessarily be connected with every Hermeneutical attempt on this subject, but hypothesis can have but little influence on a critical examination of the style, idiom, and national phraseology. Nor, if Cerinthus did write an Apocalypse, can it be proved, that his work was not one of those many, which were circulated among the early Christians under the names of Peter and other Apostles? The author of the Codex Nazaræus was evidently acquainted with St. John's book: his work contains whole passages from it, and as we see it there applied to the theories of the Nazaræans, so was it doubtless applied to those of other Heretics,—to those of Cerinthus among the rest—and this the Jewish idiom and allusions, with which it abounds, easily enabled them to achieve.—*Translator.*

They considered the contents of the Revelations, as we here see, quite in that anti-allegorical sense, and in that literal interpretation, in which Nepos explained them [p] to be gross and corporeal. When they therefore met with an opponent, who denied the rigorously literal explanation of the book, and who proposed an allegorical exposition, all their reasons were untenable, and the whole parallel between the doctrines of Cerinthus and the Apocalypse fell together to the ground.

Consequently, the *status quæstionis* is so constructed, that the dispute could only be conducted against Nepotians and their hypotheses. Let us now of our own accord conclude, who were the τινες προ ἡμῶν, the predecessors, to whom Dionysius refers, and *towhat age* they may justly lay a claim.

The manner, in which they still further treated their proposition is also to be considered. They do not merely say, that they were informed by cotemporaries of the Apostles, that John did not compose the Apocalypse,—that another wrote it—or, that they possessed authentic accounts of well-informed men, according to whom the book did not appear until after John, in this or that place. By no means—these are not the arguments which they produce; but all which they allege is extracted from the Book itself; they went through it from chapter to chapter, to show that it was without sense and connection, that there is a great absurdity in works enveloped in mystery, &c.

But even that, which they seem to advance as an ancient historical piece of learning, εἰπων τινα, ὡς ἐκ τῆς παραδοσεως, Euseb. iii. 28. that Cerinthus also taught

[p] Ἰουδαϊκότερον.... τινα χιλιαδα ἐτων τρυφης σωματικης ἐπι ξηρας ταυτης ἐσεσθαι ὑποτεθεμενος. Euseb. H. E. vii. 24.

the same, is not even to be reconciled with his doctrinal system. For that God or Christ would restore the material creation of the Demiurgus, and recall to existence the unsuccessful work of an imperfect Æon is so much the less to be expected, as this labour, beneath every superior spirit, was only assigned to the last among the Heavenly Natures. It is likewise as little to be expected, that the purest and most elevated spirit, the Christ, who is incapable of all earthly affections, sufferings, and enjoyments, should commence a reign upon this earth—should here establish his court, and give dances and sensual diversions.

There is only one individual way of reconciling the possibility of such an assertion with his opinions; namely, if we, according to a later proposition, suppose Cerinthus to have had two sorts of doctrinal systems; an earlier one, while he lived and spoke merely as a Jewish Christian,—and a second, which he formed for himself, when he became a convert to the Gnosis [p].

In this case also, a statement of Caius Presbyter might be true, who says, "but Cerinthus also, who, by means of Revelations, as if they were written by a great Apostle, presents to us fabulous tales of wonderful visions, which were manifested to him by Angels [r]; even he teaches that after the resurrection, there

[p] H. E. Gottl. Paulus, commentationes Theol. historiam Cerinthi illustraturæ. Jenæ. 1795. Hist. Cerinthi pars prior, § 17.

[r] According to Ibn Isaac as quoted by Ab Thalebi, there was a sect of Gnostical Heretics, who indulged in still greater absurdities.

قال ابن اسحاق النصاري يزعمون ان اللّٰه توفّاهُ سبع ساعات من النهار ثم احياهُ ورفعهُ اليهِ

"Ibn Isaac says, that the Christians believe, that God made him (Jesus) subject to death for seven hours in the day, that then he

shall be an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that men, in this new constitution at Jerusalem, shall abandon themselves to their appetites and pleasures; and as an enemy to the Divine Writings, he teaches with a deceitful purpose, that a space of a thousand years shall be passed in nuptial enjoyments [*].

But however the case may be, we must here dispense with this secondary inquiry, especially as we have still, in another connection, to say something respecting this passage of Caius, in that point of view, in which it is principally interesting.

Suffice it, that the predecessors of Dionysius could not produce one single historical declaration against the Apocalypse; but their whole endeavours were merely directed to render it suspected *from* its contents, in which they failed still more than the rest of their cotemporaries, who were also not very successful in their interpretation of it. And if, according to their ideas, there exists no other choice but John or Cerinthus, even this choice, which they have made, is ridiculous.

Dionysius also thought little of their critical and exegetical acumen, but interposed a conjecture, which he wished to render probable from internal grounds; namely, that there also lived in the days of the Apostle, a Presbyter at Ephesus, of the name of John, of whom Papias has occasionally spoken in his writings; him, therefore, Dionysius proposed as the author.

But neither the Predecessors of Dionysius nor himself were able to establish their opinion in Africa.

resuscitated him, and caused him to ascend to himself." Whether this was the real opinion of any Heretical sect, or merely a Mohammedan reverie, is uncertain.—*Translator.*

[*] Euseb. H. E. l. iii. c. 28.

Cyprian considered the Apocalypse to be a *Divina Scriptura, Scriptura Sancta*, by means of which God or Jesus Christ speaks[t]. As little did Lactantius, and Augustin, or other Teachers in the Latino-African Church, allow themselves to maintain the contrary. But even the Egyptians themselves, (such as Athanasius, the most renowned among the followers of Dionysius, and Marcus, the Monk,) insisted upon John the Apostle.

Such was the case in Africa; but the Asiatics were better pleased with the proposition of Dionysius; and the Bishops of the 4th century seem, for the most part, to have inclined to his side. Cyril of Jerusalem no longer mentions the Apocalypse in the catalogue of the Canonical Books, and throughout the whole of his works does not quote it. Gregory Nazianzen, the Theologian, allows to it indeed in itself an authority in doctrines of Faith, and refers to it; but in his metrical catalogue of the writings of the Testament, where he was obliged to represent the public opinion, he no where mentions it. Basilius the Cappadocian, and Epiphanius the Cyprian, spoke indeed in favour of it, as an authentic treatise of the Apostle John; Amphilochius of Iconium, however, candidly confesses that some respect the Apocalypse as inspired, but that others reject it.

The opinions of the Asiatics Eusebius has, on that account, described to us in his Canon, of which we have made mention in its proper place. He says that some place it in the first class, and others in the third. But in the latter he has placed those writings, which indeed are not of Apostolic origin, *but which nevertheless were written by pious men and orthodox*

[t] Epist. LVI. ad Thibaritan, p. 218. Ep. LXIII. ad Cæcil. p. 256. de hab. Virg. p. 216—17. Editio juxta Baluzium Veneta, 1758.

teachers. Among these they reckoned the Apocalypse; they ascribed it neither to the Apostle nor to Cerinthus, but trod in the middle path, which Dionysius had pointed out.

But independently of the Fathers of the Church in the 4th century, still earlier opponents of the Apocalypse in Asia are mentioned to us; namely, the sect of the *Alogi*[u], respecting whom, in proportion as less was known, the more was written. For Epiphanius enriched the Natural History of Heretics with a new Species, and called it that of the Alogi. The Cyprian Bishop had perhaps taken offence at the Anti-Apocalyptical notions of his neighbours and colleagues on the continent, and would fain denounce future punishment *to them* on account of their attempts.

However this may be, he invented a Heresy, in which he comprised those who contradicted the Gospel of John and his Logos, or the Apocalypse, or *both* together. There were certainly many, who had indulged in censures respecting the one or the other, or both together: such as Cerinthus, the Nazaræans, the Ebionites, Cerdo, Marcion, and several more; he had also shortly before added Theodotus to the number, who does not at all deserve this with regard to the Gospel, unless he be included with them on

[u] Epiphanius, who first (as Hug observes) gave to them this name, thus describes them in Hær. L. i. p. 184:—Φασκουσι τοινυν οἱ Ἄλογοι· ταυτην γαρ αὐτοῖς τιθημι την ἐπωνυμιαν, ἀπο γαρ τοῦ δεῦρο οὐτως κληθησονται· και οὐτως, ἀγαπητοι, ἐπιθῶμεν αὐτοῖς ὀνομα, τουτεστιν, ἄλογοι· εἰχον γαρ την αἱρεσιν καλουμενην, ἀποβαλλουσαν Ἰωαννου τας βιβλους, ἐπει οὐν τον λογον οὐ δεχονται τον παρα Ἰωαννου κεκηρυγμενον, ἄλογοι κληθησονται· ἀλλοτριοι τοινυν πανταπασιν ὑπαρχοντες τοῦ κηρυγματος, και οὐτε το τοῦ Ἰωαννου εὐαγγελιον δεχονται, οὐτε την αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλυψιν. In a subsequent passage, he states his reason for assigning to them this name, ἐπειδη ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ἀποβαλλονται—κ'. τ'. λ'. Cf. Augustinum de Hæresibus, c. xxx. et Danæ[illegible] Augustinum.—*Translator*.

account of the Apocalypse, which we do not know. But all these and the others, whom he also might have added, were implicated in other heresies, and their ALOGICAL assertions were only a secondary affair, which was more or less connected with their theories.

For this reason, all that he says is indefinite, because he formed a leading character from a casual and not at all a decisive criterion, and from this united individuals, who were most perfectly distinct from each other. He might just as well have written about the heresy of the ANTI-LUKÆANS, because many rejected the Gospel of Luke, or his Acts of the Apostles, or both together. This heresy in Epiphanius is consequently without a beginning and without an end, without a cause, without a country, without leaders and ramifications: he constantly hovers about merely general terms; and informs us nothing respecting the history of his ALOGI, excepting that at one time such had existed in Thyatira, and had offended against the Apocalypse; with respect to the Gospels, he had no accusations against them. Also respecting these he leaves us uninformed as to their origin, beginning, connexion, &c., and contents himself with merely stating the time, since which they had ceased to exist there.

"When these (says he) and the Cataphrygians had there fixed their place of action..... they drew the whole city with them into their error; but those, who denied the Apocalypse, have themselves confirmed the admonitions (of the Apocalypse) with regard to those times." "But now (he continues), in the present moment, after 112 years, there is a Church there; it is increasing, and already others have arisen. But at that time the whole

Church had passed over into that of the Cataphrygians [x]."

Thus he relates to us the termination of these Heretics at Thyatira, from which, up to the time, when Epiphanius wrote his Hæresiological work, 112 years had elapsed. But he wrote it under Valentinian the First, in the 12th year of his reign, i. e. in the year 375 or 376 after the birth of our Lord. If now the 112 years had previously elapsed, their termination falls in the year 262: nearly in those times, when Dionysius had effected the accommodation between the Nepotians and Anti-Apocalypticans in Egypt.

One would certainly suppose from this coincidence of events, that the Alogi of Thyatira were in connexion and mutual understanding with the Egyptians, who, about this time, had submitted to the Church.

If, then, that which Epiphanius at the commencement of the introduction to this treatise, says respecting this sect, holds good with regard to the Asiatic Alogi (for he does not even say a word of the African), if that indeed holds good respecting them, namely, that they wished to ascribe the Apocalypse to Cerinthus; so this agreement in an absurdity shews, that they were any thing but independent of each other.

But even the arguments which they extracted from the Book itself, from its obscurity, its impenetrable contents, *τα ἐν τῃ Ἀποκαλυψει βαθεως, και σκοτεινως*

[x] Epiphan. Hær. LI. p. 198. Ed. Basil. Another still more obscure determination of time respecting the beginning of the Montanists,—*ὁς ἠν χρονος μετα τοῦ Σωτηρος ἀναληψιν ἐπι ἐννενηκοντα και τριειν ἐτεσιν, ὡς μελλουσης της ἐκεισε ἐκκλησιας πλανᾶσθαι και χωνευεσθαι ἐν τῃ κατα φρυγας αἱρεσει*, l. c. cannot here be adduced, as he only expressly mentions it respecting the Montanists.

εἰρημενα, are the very same, that the Africans applied to similar purposes.

It is likewise evident, from all the proofs which Epiphanius has urged against them, and from all the arguments, to which he refers on their side of the question, that they did not dispute from documents, but from the different ideas, which each entertained of the Book, and that their reasonings against the testimonies of the ancients, could not deserve attention, unless they were perfectly correct and incontrovertible.

These are the occurrences, which the Apocalypse experienced in these two parts of the world; and now we would also turn our survey to Europe, for the sake also of observing its reception and progress there. But very few of the European Greeks during the first Christian centuries, either acquired by means of their works any merit on the score of religion, or an honorable memory for themselves; and even the writings of these few, as, for instance, those of the excellent Dionysius of Corinth, could not guard themselves against the violences of the age. We therefore seek in vain for a solution of this question among them, and are directed to the Westerns, among whom we would now collect researches.

One of the most ancient monuments of the Roman Church is the Pastor of Hermas, the first part of which is occupied with visions, the second with moral precepts, and the third with allegories. The first and the last parts have such an uncommon similarity, in their plan, to the Apocalypse, that in individual parts we should conceive them to be an imitation of it. It is well known, what profane Philology acquires in favour of the authenticity of ancient works from the imitation of them; the very same advantage might avail us here, if by an impartial

him as a Western, according to the marble-monument, which was discovered on the wall at St. Laurence in the year 1551, wrote ὑπερ του κατα Ἰωαννην εὐαγγελιου, και Ἀποκαλυψεως, and also according to the account of Jerome, DE APOCALYPSI. Andreas of Cappadocia has often and honestly made use of his illustrations of the Apocalypse with the name of the author, and Jacobus Edessenus, on the same occasion, has referred to the exposition of this renowned teacher [b].

The anonymous author in Muratori declares John, the predecessor of the Apostle Paul, to have been author of the Revelations [c]. This anonymous person, according to the judgment of some scholars, is supposed to be Caius, the Roman Presbyter; but others enumerate this same Caius among the declared opposers of the Apocalypse. He had indeed once acted a similar part, when he gave a different direction to the opinions of the Westerns respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews: we therefore cannot in this place dismiss him without a strict examination. A branch of the history of the Apocalypse worthy of notice among the Westerns might otherwise easily escape us, and the remaining branches would then be incoherent.

The accusation against Caius is founded upon a passage of Eusebius previously cited, who, in treating of the dogmata of Cerinthus, explains himself in the following assertions. "Caius writes thus of him; but Cerinthus also (who by means of Revelations, as

[b] Ephræm Syr. Opp. T. 1. p. 292. ابعضكوهك مبعا
ماهسعصا سهزا م هعهص كي كعا.

[c] Antiq. Ital. M. Œ. T. iii. p. 854. Cum ipse Beatus Apostolus Paulus, sequens prædecessoris sui Joannis ordinem, nonnisi nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat, etc. Cf. the additional observations on this subject in the discussion of the Canon.

this opposition can then only refer to the Revelation of John, which alone has allotted a period of a thousand years to the Dead to reign with Christ, xx. 4, 5.

I here quote the words of a more modern scholar, who has elucidated this fragment of Caius with an acuteness peculiar to him: "Manifestius autem adhuc discerni videntur *αἱ Ἀποκαλυψεις* illæ Cerinthianæ à Canonicâ, dum Caius à Cerintho numerum mille annorum in festum aliquod nuptiale *fraudis studio atque ex odio Sacrarum Scripturarum* applicatum fuisse innuit. Quarumnam enim Dei Scripturarum odio, ut numericè mille annorum festum

tenth chapter of the Book of Enoch. St. John's words in Rev. xx. 5. mention a particular period connected with the first Resurrection. Whether we may argue from his symbolical language, that he actually intended 1000 years, is most uncertain, because אלף perpetually occurs for a very great and indefinite number. Thus in Deut. vii. 9, God is said to keep his covenant לאלף דור *to a thousand generations*, which is irrefragably proved in Ps. cv. 8. to mean לעולם *for ever*. The Rabbinical writers determine the first Resurrection to be the intermediate period between the days of the Messiah and עולם הבא, by which I understand them to mean the time intervening between Messiah Ben Joseph and Messiah Ben David, according to a Gloss on Sanhedrin, f. 92. c. 1. Pocock's remarks,—"ait.—Cl. Vir Johannes Cochius Sectam Nachmanidis duplicem statuere Resurrectionem, generalem, *scil. omnium hominum* ....Ante hanc vero aliam, quâ non nisi qui meriti fuerint, ad consueta vitæ terrestris munia reversuri sint, quando Christus advenerit." We must not however accept this passage in the Apocalypse *literally*, nor *numerically*, because this number both in Greek, and the Asiatic languages has continually an *indefinite* and *unrestricted* signification. (See the Preface.)

St. John in the Millenium, which seems from the context to be the space of this first Resurrection, how long soever it may be, certainly alluded to current traditions. Cf. vocem אירק in Lexico Aruch, Platonis Rempublicam, L. x. (de Ero filio Armenii), Virg. Æn. L. vi. 748. His allusion, therefore, from its concidence with antecedent legends, might easily have given rise to the speculations of Heresiarchs, and have been alleged as an evidence of their theories.—*Translator.*

impostor fingeret, adduci potuerit, nisi ipsius Apocalypseos Canonicæ? Alibi enim in S. Codice mille annos festos promitti non novimus. Mens igitur Caii alia non videtur esse posse, præter hanc: finxisse Cerinthum Judaismo plenum proprias ἀποκαλυψεις, atque ut facilius falleret lecturos, ipsum etiam illum mille annorum numerum ex Divinis Libris, ipsi adeò, ut in pessimam partem iis uti non vereretur, exosis mutuum sumpsisse, suumque plasma eâ Canonicæ Apocalypseos similitudine adfectâ exornâsse [f]."

This is the more certain, as Eusebius, where he in his history designedly treats of Caius's peculiar opinion respecting the Canon, does not once say, that he had attacked the Apocalypse. Neither was Jerome ever acquainted with any sentiment of the *Presbyter*, which was unfavorable to the Book. But Photius, who still had all his writings before him, and who produces some critical accounts of them, extracts from them, as the principal point to be remarked, the circumstance of his not admitting the Epistle to the Hebrews, without having perceived in them any trace of a similar conduct against the Apocalypse [g].

This Book likewise had, neither in Rome nor in the other Latin Churches, the public opinion against it, as was the case with the Epistle to the Hebrews. Some time after, the Confessors of the Roman Presbytery made use of it in a letter to Cyprian of Carthage, which has reached us in his collection of Epistles [h].

After them, Victorinus of Pannonia, Hilarius of Poictiers, Gennadius of Marseilles, Orosius of Spain

[f] G. Paulus Comment. Theol. Histor. Cerinthi illustraturæ. Hist. Cerinth. Pars prior. § 30.

[g] Euseb. H. E. vi. 21. Hieronym. Catalog. V. Cajus. Photius cod. 48. Hœschel. p. 16.

[h] Epistola inter Cyprianiacas xxvi. Ed. Venet. p. 92.

in the Apology against Pelagius; and several others reckoned the Apocalypse among the Divine Books of the New Testament, and made use of it in the same manner, as they used the rest.

Nevertheless it appears, if we rightly understand Jerome, that the Latin Church did not entirely concede to this writing the authority of a canonical book. He says, in his observations upon the 149th Psalm,....the Apocalypse, which is read and received in the Churches, is not reckoned among the Apocryphal but among the *Ecclesiastical* books, *neque enim inter Apocryphas Scripturas habetur, sed inter Ecclesiasticas.*

In the strict sense of the word, *Ecclesiastica Scriptura*, is only a writing of the second order. It is well known, that a cotemporary of Jerome classes the Books, which belong to the Old and New Covenant, or those which institute any claim to it, *in Canonicos, Ecclesiasticos, et Apocryphos.* Now if the Father of the Church connected the same signification with the expression *Liber Ecclesiasticus*, we here meet with an unexpected phænomenon. The Latins would in this case, have placed this Book in the second class, among the controverted, to which it would have belonged. Consequently it would have been fortunately inserted in all three classes, and according to the doctrines of the Alogi, it should even be added to the fourth, or the fictitious writings of the Heretics. A singular fate for this writing!

But Jerome does not use the expression so strongly, but uses it in the same sense, as his cotemporary. For in the Epistle to Dardanus, he says, if the Latins do not admit the Epistle to the Hebrews among the Canonical writings, so the Greek Churches also, with equal freedom, do not adopt the Apocalypse of John; but I acknowledge both; for I do not adhere

to the custom of the age, b
of more ancient authors, wl
from both, and indeed *as Can*
writings .... and not merel
ings are sometimes used,—*n*
cryphis facere solent, sed qu
CLESIASTICIS.

Here Jerome has so expr
should think, that he made no
nonical and Ecclesiastical, and
signification to the one word

But even his cotemporary,
spoken, the Presbyter Ruffi
signification of *Canonical, Ecc*
phal, in the strongest sense, an
the New Testament accordi
the Apocalypse being exclud
the writings of the first ra
down into the division of the
terns. He quotes it under th
works, and indeed not acco
partial judgment, but, as he
self, when he commences to
"these are the works of the O
which, according to the doctri
Predecessors, are considered
were inspired by the Holy Spi
in the Churches, as we are in
ments of the Fathers." And
logue he adds,—"these are
Fathers have inserted into t
they have appointed to us as
of our Faith."

According to this, there is
Latins having suffered themsel
by the dissensions of the Afr

by those of the Asiatics, as to have made any alteration, on account of the Apocalypse, in the established division of the Books of the New Testament.

SECTION CLXXVII.

The Apocalypse, in the treatment of its subjects, frequently enters into very great circumstantiality, and pourtrays them with many embellishments; but there is much in the detail, which seems not to be essential, and nevertheless communicates to the subject its perfect scope. The minor incidents become thereby often significant; and it is difficult to give an outline of the whole, because in such an outline the incidents must necessarily be neglected. Yet will we endeavour to bring the whole into one survey.

John beheld at Patmos, in a trance, a form like that of a man between seven lamps; in which, however, all was Superhuman, uncommonly Glorious and Divine. This form commanded him to write seven Epistles to seven communities of Asia, the symbols of which are the seven surrounding lamps, which are tended by seven Spirits. These Epistles commend the virtues, censure the faults of the seven Churches, admonish some to amend, and others to be constant [1].

* * * * * *

[1] To the greater part of this splendid imagery we find parallels, besides those which Wetstein has noticed. The Book of Enoch, xviii. 10., mentions a vision of seven stars, which are explained to be Angels, which agrees with the 16th verse of Rev. i., and that there was some connexion between them, that either John had seen this Book, or that this part of the Book was borrowed from John, is evident from the similar effect, which was produced by the vision. Thus,

This took place on the Earth; but now the gate of Heaven is opened, and an herald commanded John to enter. Here he saw God on a throne, encircled with glory, and round him four and twenty of his[k] elect

Enoch fell on his face, as if he were dead, until the Angel revived him; and John says, *επεσα προς τους ποδας αυτου, ως νεκρος· και επεθηκε την δεξιαν αυτου χειρα επ' εμε, λεγων μοι· Μη φοβου.* vers. 17. —*Translator.*

[k] This magnificent description of the Throne of God is, in an inferior style, imitated in Pirki Eliezer, c. 4. *There* four tribes of ministering Angels are described eternally hymning the Divine praises. The first tribe is headed by Michael on the right, the second by Gabriel on the left, the third by Uriel in front, the fourth by Raphael behind it; (*κυκλοθεν του θρονου*—Apoc.) The Shekinah is in the middle of the throne (*εν μεσῳ του θρονου—αρνιον εστηκος*). On the head of the Shekinah is a crown (rather the כתר *κατ' εξοχην*) in the front of which is the SHEM HAMPORASH OR INCOMMUNICABLE NAME: thus Apoc. xix. 16. the Logos *εχει επι το ἱματιον και επι το μηρον αυτου το ονομα γεγραμμενον*, Βασιλευς *βασιλεων και* Κυριος Κυριων. In like manner, as in the Revelations, his eyes are said to pervade the whole earth: a veil is expanded before him: a fiery sceptre is in his hand. Within that veil *seven Angels* minister unto him; the lightning flashes and the thunder rolls around him: (*αστραπαι, και βρονται, και φωναι*) his throne resembles sapphire, and the Cherubic animals (*τεσσαρα ζωα*) are at its feet. Two Seraphim stand, one at the right, the other at the left;—each has six wings, with two of which they veil their faces, lest they should behold the face of the Shekinah, and with two they veil their feet, and with two they fly, the one exclaiming to the other, Holy, Holy, Holy, is the LORD GOD OF TSABAOTH! the whole earth is filled with HIS GLORY! *Και τεσσαρα ζωα, εν καθ' εαυτο, ειχον ανα πτερυγας εξ κυκλοθεν, και εσωθεν γεμοντα οφθαλμων. και αναπαυσιν ουκ ειχον ημερας και νυκτος, λεγοντα· Αγιος, Αγιος, Αγιος, Κυριος ο Θεος, ο Παντοκρατωρ, ο ων, και ο ερχομενος.*

In this same work, the Just are described, as having crowns of gold on their heads (*και εσχον επι τας κεφαλας στεφανους χρυσους.*) The description of the animals is precisely the same in both works. In another Rabbinical treatise, the thunders, the lightnings, the voices, and the lamps, are enumerated among the inferior Sephiroth, and it is singular, that their number also is restricted to *seven*. The act of throwing the crowns before the throne, is borrowed from Oriental

on four and twenty seats. He had in his hand a Book with seven seals, and no one in the whole creation was able to loosen them. But a Lamb, which stood on the middle of the Throne, opened these seven seals amidst the hymns and praises of the Spiritual World—vi.

At the opening of the first seal, he perceives a Hero with the insignia of victory. At that of the second, peace vanishes from the earth; at that of the third[1], famine approaches; at that of the fourth,

customs: thus, in the Midrash on Yalcut Simeoni, p. 1. f. 55. 2. the Kings, who were present at Pharaoh's court, when Moses and Aaron performed their miracles before them, הסירו כתריהם מעל ראשיהם: as all Governors of Provinces are accustomed to do, when they advance to meet an Asiatic Monarch.

The Herald, who in the vision introduced John, is called הכרוז by the Jews, by way of eminence. Amidst the scenery of the vision is a Book sealed with seven seals, which no one could open. Here the phraseology is highly Oriental: and the general description proves the author to have been well-versed in the learning of his day. Abu Ali Ibn Sina, in like manner, having perceived, in his researches into nature, things, which exceeded the human understanding, is said to have exclaimed, هذا كتاب لا سبيل الي فهمهٔ, *there is no access to this book*, and the notion of a sealed book, as a metaphor of something unknown or mysterious, was common to the Jewish Prophets and all the East. In many countries, a festival called that of breaking the seals, was observed with great splendour, and still exists among the Chinese; consequently, when the Herald proclaimed, τις ἐστιν ἀξιος ἀνοῖξαι το βιβλιον, και λῦσαι τας σφραγῖδας αὐτοῦ; the reference probably made to some well-known allusion gave a force to the passage, of which it is now deprived. Yet no one can read the symbolical and mysterious ideas, which both the Talmudists and Arabs have affixed to seals, without arguing from general analogy, that John's meaning has found but a partial interpretation in the public opinion, and that he must have been thoroughly acquainted as well with the sacred as with the traditional knowledge of the age.—*Translator.*

[1] The ζυγον mentioned at the opening of the third seal, is noticed in the book of Enoch, c. lxx. 11., and the soul of Abel is said in a

from the abodes of affliction, and are now comforted and sing praises to God—viii. The seventh seal is opened; all [m] Heaven is silent: and now seven Angels appear with seven trumpets. The prayers of the Saints lie upon an altar before God, and the fragrance of them ascends unto Him—viii. 7.

* * * * * *

The first of the seven Angels begins the blast of war; fire, hail, and blood fall upon the earth. At the sound of the second trumpet, a fiery mountain is precipitated into the sea, and the third part of the water becomes blood. The third trumpet is sounded, and a brightly shining star falls upon the third part of the rivers and fountains, which are embittered by it. The fourth sounds; then the third part of the sun, of the moon, and of the stars becomes darkened. An eagle flies through the midst of heaven, and cries, Woe to the inhabitants of the earth! The fifth sounds, and a star falls from Heaven, having the keys of the abyss which it opens, from whence all sorts of poisonous vermin come forth. At the sound of the sixth trumpet, the four Angels, which

[m] The most profound silence was required by the Jews during the offering of incense, and no one was allowed to be within the sanctuary at the time. Lev. xvi. 11—18. At least from this Law the practice was observed by the Jews: cf. Maim. Mishn. תמידים iii. § 3. Maimonides, indeed, frequently says, מבין האולם ולמזבח לא יהיה שם אדם, *no one may be between the vestibule and the altar*, whence the Jews commonly say, סמא דכולא משתיקא, *the best incense is silence*. When Zachariah was offering the incense, Luke particularly remarked, that the people were praying ἔξω, *without*. Among the Gentiles, no one was allowed to speak, when the victim was slain: hence the formulary, *favete linguis*:—hence also Propertius l. iv. El. 6. 1. writes,

Sacra facit vates! *sint ora faventia sacris*,
Et cadat ante meos *icta juvenca* focos.

Translator.

were bound on the Euphrates, are loosened[n]; the third part of mankind perishes in war,—the survivors nevertheless do not repent, nor desist from their idolatry.

An Angel of a colossal form speaks with the voice of seven thunders, and extends a book to John, who is obliged to swallow it; he swallows it, begins to prophesy, and[o] measures the edifice of the temple; but the outer court and the city he abandons to the enemies. Two martyrs, who are mentioned in magnificent terms of eulogy, are also obliged to prophesy, and die *in the allegorical Sodom;—the tenth part of the city dies*—xi. 15. The seventh Angel sounds his trumpet. The four and twenty Elders fall down be-

[n] The description of the Locusts in ix. 7. is borrowed from Joel ii. 4—7. Cazvini in voce جراد divides them in like manner into سوار و پیادہ *horsemen and infantry*, and from the devastations which they occasioned, innumerable fables arose concerning them. Some pretended, that particular words were inscribed on their wings, and De Beauplan gravely asserted, that *the plague of God* might be distinctly seen written upon them. In the Persian Miscellanies, 176, the following Arabic sentence is stated to be inscribed on them.

نحن جند الله الاكبر لنا تسعة وتسعون بيضة و لو تمّت لنا المايّة لاكلنا الد نيا بما فيها

"We are the army of the Omnipotent God: each of us has ninety-nine eggs, if the hundred were complete to us, assuredly we should devour the world, and all that is in it."

We read in Shabbath, f. 89. 1. of Abaddon and Death אבדון ומות (cf. vers. 11.) and in f. 116. 1. of בית־אבידן, under which term the Jews afterwards included the Christian school. But in Zohar on Numb. f. 74. c. 294., Abaddon is said to be the lowest cell in Gihinnom. Here the name is applied to the Ἄγγελος τοῦ Ἀβύσσου. —*Translator.*

[o] In the book of Enoch we read of Angels, who are employed in measuring, in the same manner as John is here described to be.—*Translator.*

fore God's throne, and sing unto him a triumphal song, xii.

* * * * * *

A woman appears in Heaven; she is clothed with the sun, under her feet is the moon, on her head is a crown of stars. Her hour of delivery approaches, and a Dragon is lying in wait for the child, who is destined to rule [p] the nations with his sceptre. But Michael hurls the Dragon down to the earth, which occasions a general jubilee of the Heavenly Host. But even from thence he persecutes the woman in labour, who avoids him by a flight into desolate regions, where she brings forth and nurses her child. Therefore, the Dragon wages war with the remaining adherents of the woman, xiii.

[p] ποιμαινειν παντα τα ἐθνη. Ludovicus Cappellus supposes the sense to be, *to crush all nations*, referring ποιμαινειν to רעע, which is sometimes confounded with רעה, in its tenses and derivative forms. But, this would pre-suppose a Hebrew original, in the admission of which the Book would fully justify us, if we had any *historical* authority for the assertion. Nevertheless, St. John may have made use of ποιμαινειν in this sense; as we find it applied indifferently to any Government, whether it be mild or tyrannical.

But at ver. 5. the Child is said to have been "caught up to God and his Throne," parallel to which in the fables respecting Rachel in Yalcut Rubeni, f. 87. 2. Michael is said to have descended and borne *her* child up to כסא הכבוד. The same work, f. 87. 2. mentions the war in Heaven between the Celestial and Infernal Powers, which St. John has cited in the 7th verse; and a name similar to that given to the Evil Spirit at the 9th is of common occurrence in the Rabbinical writers, *e. g.* נחש הקדמוני who almost in the words of the Evangelist is said in Bahir on Zohar, f. 27, c. 107. to have been hurled from Heaven. R. Yehudah Hakkodesh asserts Michael, in this instance, to have been an ἐπιφανεια of the Divine Majesty, and as St. John speaks of Σατανᾶς και οἱ Ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ, so he speaks of סמאל וחיילותיו, who is described, exactly as at the 10th verse, as the מקטרג or קטיגור, the Accuser of the Just, day and night, before God.—*Translator.*

In the meantime there arises from the sea a marine Monster, with seven heads, ten horns, and ten diadems. It wages war upon the saints: all nations worship it. Another arises from the earth with two horns and speaks like a Dragon: it subjects mankind to the power of the marine Beast, makes an image of him, and commands the world to worship him[q]; then it marks his worshippers with a peculiar character. The Beast himself bears the number 666—six hundred and sixty-six.

But the Lamb stands upon Sion and marks his faithful followers, and new songs of praise resound in his honour, xiv.

Three Angels appear in Heaven. The one bears on high the everlasting Gospel: the other exclaims, [r] Babylon is fallen: the third proclaims punishments

[q] In this description, the Jewish idea of the Books of the Living and the Dead, which are everlastingly open before God, is evident at verse 8. (ספרי חיים וספרי מתים פתוחון לפניו) and the deceptions and pious frauds of the Gentile Priests in causing images to move, and to seem to be endued with life, (which were practised on particular occasions both in the East and West, wherever Paganism prevailed,) are clearly intended at v. 15. The marks also, which the idolaters burnt or painted on their bodies, among which the thunderbolt of Jupiter, the helmet of Minerva, the spear of Mars, the ivy of Bacchus, the trident of Neptune, and the caduceus of Mercury were the most common, are noticed in characters too vivid to be mistaken, at ver. 16. This χαραγμα τοῦ ὀνοματος, as it was called, prevailed among the Canaanites and idolatrous Jews, as is manifest from Isaiah and the Prophets. Cf. Potter's Arch. Gr. l. i. c. 10. p. 55. Tertullian and Augustin believed, that the Christians also burnt the sign of the cross upon their bodies. Cf. Hieron. Præf. in Job. But, as numbers and mystical marks were very frequently burnt likewise on the foreheads and hands of the Pagans, it is inferible, that John in the 18th verse may have had some reference also to this practice. Almost the exact formulary of its introduction recurs in Zohar Khodesh, f. 30. 3. רזא דחכמתא אית הנא.—*Translator.*

[r] The Jews, as well as the Christians, made mention of Rome,

to the worshippers of the Beast. A human form appears above a cloud with a sickle in his hand, and an Angel also appears with a sickle: the one performs the harvest, the other the vintage, xv.

* * * * * *

Seven * Angels with seven vials of wrath come forth from the Tabernacle of God, surrounded with smoke. The first poured out his vial, thence flowed imposthumes and ulcers upon the earth. The second poured it over the sea, which bubbled up like coagulated blood. The third poured it over the rivers and fountains, which immediately streamed with blood. The fourth poured it over the Sun, and men were scorched; the fifth over the Throne of the Beast, and he was enveloped with darkness. The sixth poured his vial over the Euphrates, and its springs were dried up. Finally the seventh poured out his via in the air, and a voice resounded out of God's sanctuary from Heaven—it is finished!—Nature seemed to be reversed; every terrible phænomenon burst forth in it, to complete the destruction, xvii.

under the name of Babylon, either from fear of expressly writing against the Romans, or from a supposed resemblance between the captivity in Babylon, and the oppressions, which they sustained from the Romans. Thus, we read in Shir. Hashirim Rab. f. 8. 3. דוו קריין רומי בבלין: they also ascribed to it the title, which St. John has given to it—רומי רבתא *Mighty Rome*—כרך חנדול *the Great city*. —*Translator.*

* It has been conceived, that John in the beginning of the xvith ch. referred to Isaiah li. 17. In the 5th verse, the Ἄγγελος τῶν ὑδατων, the שר של ים, whom the Rabbinical writers name רהב from that Passage in the Psalms, where Rahab is mentioned in conjunction with the Leviathan or Crocodile, is enumerated, as one of the seven Angels. At the last verse of the Chapter, χαλαζα μεγαλη ὡς ταλαντιαια is said to descend upon mankind, which closely corresponds to the immense hail, which according to the Talmud will descend on the Earth in the days of Gog and Magog.—*Translator.*

Now One of the seven Angels approaches, leads John into the desert, shows to him another woman, sitting upon a scarlet beast with seven Heads and ten Horns. She bears the name of Babylon on her forehead, is intoxicated with the blood of the Saints, and allures nations to whoredom. The Heads are seven Hills, the Horns are ten Kings. The Beast is on the verge of destruction, xviii.

Another Angel descends from Heaven, proclaims the destruction of Babylon: and calls upon the nations to take vengeance of her. An Elegy arises on the Earth on account of Babylon. In Heaven a Hallelujah is sung; for the nuptial day of the Lamb is approaching, xix. 11.

* * * * * *

Now [1] the Conqueror on the White Horse is seen

[1] There are occasionally some close similarities in the Apocalypse to the Apocryphal Ascension of Moses, and Ascension of Isaiah. The latter has survived to us entire in an Æthiopic version. In this we observe a striking resemblance to Rev. xix. 10. The words are:

ወወደቁ ፡ በገጽዋ ፡ ኀመ ፡ እስግድ ፡ ሎተ፡ ወኢነደገኒ፡ መልእኽ፡ ዘይመረሐኝ ፡ ለሳ ፡ ይበለኝ፡ ኢትስገድ፡ ወኢለመልእኽ ፡ ወኢለመኝበረ ፡ ለዘ፡ እምስድሰቱ ፡ ሰማያ ፡ እምነበ ፡ ተፈገውኩ፡ እምራኳኽ ፡ ዘእንቦለ ፡ ለገ ፡ እግረኽ ፡ በሳብዕ፡ ሰማያ ፡፡

* * * * * * *

ወሶበሃ ፡ ይበለኝ ፡ መልእኽ ፡ ዘይመረሐኒ ፡ ለዝ፡ ስግድ ፡ ወስግድኩ ፡ ወሶባሕኩ ፡፡

"And I fell upon my face, to worship him, but the Angel, who conducted me, stopped me, saying, Worship not either an Angel or

again. His Name is written on his Thigh, he is called KING OF KINGS, he is also the ΛΟΓΟΣ ΘΕΟΥ. An Angel who stands in the Sun, beckons the birds of the air to the field of Battle, where bodies of Princes and Mighty Men in great numbers await them: for their last attempts at resistance were unavailing, XX.

In the meantime, an Angel descends from Heaven, who has the keys of the abyss; there he chains the Sea-Monster, and locks his prison for a thousand years, during which time the Dead reign with Jesus. But after this period, He will again arise to battle, and call distant nations to his assistance, although in vain: he will be eternally consigned to the torments of fire, xx. 11.

The Judge is already seated upon the Throne; the Fabric of the World trembles in disordered commotion, the Book of Life is unrolled, the Graves give up their Dead, the Sentence is past [n],—xxi.

the Throne *of Him*, who is in the sixth Heaven, whence I am sent down to conduct thee, until in the seventh Heaven I shall bid thee.

* * * * * * *

"Immediately, the Angel, who conducted me, said to me, WORSHIP HIM—and I worshipped and adored HIM."

As titles were formerly inscribed on Vests in the East, and the Jews were accustomed to write Scriptural passages on their phylacteries, as the Mohammedans Koranic sentences about their houses, &c. &c. St. John appears to have borrowed from thence his allusion at the 16th verse, which bears an uncommon similarity to some of the titles of the Sassanian kings deciphered and translated by De Sacy.—*Translator.*

[n] St. John seems, v. 12., to refer to the words of Daniel. The Mohammedans likewise believe the existence of a Book, in which human Actions are recorded. Thus, the interpreters explain the Koranic passage—اذا الصحف نشرت—*when the Book shall be expanded*——التي فيها اعمال بني ادم تشرت الحساب—*that, in*

A New Heaven and a New Earth are formed. A New Jerusalem, adorned like a Bride, descends upon Earth; its Towers, its Walls, its Palaces, are embellished with Characters of Christianity. Consolation, Tranquillity, Peace, Eternal Light, and the Kingdom of God are there [x]—xxii. 6.

which the actions of the Sons of Men are written, shall be unfolded, that they may render an account. From the several processes to take place, the Arabs call this appointed time يوم الدين *the Day of Judgment*—يوم القضاء or يوم الحكم, *the Day of Decision*—يوم الحساب, *the Day of rendering an Account*—يوم الجزاء, *the Day of Retribution*—يوم القصاص, *the Day of Vengeance*—يوم الفصل, *the Day of Discernment or making a Difference*—يوم المسايلة, *the Day of Interrogation*—يوم الوزن, *the Day of Weighing* (Scil. *in a balance*)—يوم الفراق, *the Day of Separating*.

The δευτερος θανατος in v. 14. is the same as Eternal Death, or מות בע"הז" ובע"הב. In Pirki Eliezer and Yalcut Rubeni the phrase recurs; *e. g.* מות שני and מיתא תנייא. Thus Andreas Cæsariensis interpreted it, ὁ δευτερος θανατος, τουτεστιν, ἡ ἀτελευτητος κολασις: and Chrysostom αἰωνιος and ἀθανατος θανατος. From several passages, also, in the Targum of Jerusalem, it is evident that it signified the Death and Future State of the Wicked; *e. g.*

יחי ראובן בעלמא הדין ולא ימות במותנא תנינא דבה מיתין רשעיא לעלמא דאתי:

"Let Reuben live in this World, nor let him die in the second Death, in which the Wicked shall die in the World to come!"—Deut. xxxiii. 6.

Jonathan says the same, with the omission of תנינא.—*Translator.*

[x] Several Jews believed a Renovation of the World, and the Creation of New Heavens, שמים חדשים. In the Midrash on Zohar, and in Yalcut Rubeni, a new Temple and a new Jerusalem are stated to be about hereafter to descend from Heaven, with which statement St. John seems to identify himself, by the introduction of the Shekinah. The Codex Nazaræus says, ܟܠܗ ܡܢ ܡܬܐ ܘܠܐ ܡܬ ܒܗ ܐܠܐ ܚܝܐ ܘܢܘܗܪܐ ܘܠܐ ܚܫܘܟܐ ܒܗ ܠܐ ܐܝܬ. "The World in which HE resides is devoid of Death; it is a World of Light and Splendour: in which there is no Darkness." This is nearly parallel to the Apoca-

Now follow a concluding discourse to John, and a concluding discourse from John to his readers.

SECTION CLXXVIII.

In no book were the interpreters so unfortunate as in this: a proof, that soon after the fall of the Jewish state, the acquaintance with the opinions and the peculiar views of this nation was likewise effaced, and that the comprehension of Jewish expressions

lyptical description of the New Jerusalem (v. 23. et seq.), and was perhaps originally borrowed from Is. LX. ix., from which Yalcut Rubeni, f. 7. 3., has also produced a similar account, saying, almost in the words of the Apostle, איננו צרייכים לאור הסה ביום ולא לאור הלבנה בלילה: "they shall not require the Light of the Sun by day, nor the Light of the Moon by night." Cf. Shemoth Rabba, § 18. f. 118. c. 1.

St. John also, in v. 4., seems to have borne in mind the Jewish descriptions of the times of the Messiah, which will be marked by ten criteria:—the eighth of these is, that there shall be *no more weeping and lamentation:* the ninth, that *Death shall cease for ever;* the tenth, that there shall be *no more sorrow and affliction*, because universal joy shall prevail. In another account of these times, we still further recognize ὁτι τα πρῶτα ἀπῆλθεν, in מה דאזל אזל and the πηγη τοῦ ὑδατος τῆς ζωῆς, in the Sabbatic river, or מעין הע"ב ver. 6.

St. John furnishes this City with twelve Gates, according to the number of the Tribes; in like manner, Zohar mentions twelve Gates to the entrance of עולם הבא, on each of which is inscribed the name of a Tribe. Moreover, the fifth of the ten Jewish criteria affirms, that God will rebuild Jerusalem of Sapphire, that the effulgence of its stones will attract the Gentiles to behold the Glory of Israel; and that every precious stone and gem will be lavished on the City and its Temple. The Apostle affirms much the same in v. 19. 24, 25, The commencement of the xxii. ch. bears a close resemblance to Ezekiel, the Book of Enoch, and the Jewish legends:—and almost every nation has counterparts to the Paradisiacal tree and the water of life.—*Translator.*

and Palestinian imagery was lost even among the Asiatics. We may no longer include that, which occurred in this respect in much later times. At one time, Antichrist and the end of the world, at another the history of the Church were seen represented therein in visions; then the history of the world, the Saracens, the Huns, the Turks, etc., were added to it. At length the turn came to the Pope, the corruption of the Clergy, the Roman Church, and the Reformation, and many other things of this sort, which were in no one degree more sensible.

Among the moderns, Bossuet trod a more judicious path[y]. The Apocalypse appeared to him to treat of the conquest of Rome and of the dismemberment of its Empire, which events really took place under the command of Alaric, the King of the Goths. Unto this period the Book extends, and shows the Divine Judgments upon the idolatrous State, which had so often oppressed Christianity, which now is at last revenged, and triumphs over every violence. The intermediate events, which are here still further discussed, are the Fate of the Christian School under the Cæsars, its persecutions, principally that of Dioclesian; its momentary tranquillity under Constantine, then the oppressions of Julian, which hastened the Punishment.

These Bossuet, whom Calmet afterwards followed, considered to be the contents of the Revelations. Wetstein, on his part, conceived the transactions differently, and principally descried in them the Destruction of Jerusalem, the Fate of the Jewish Religion connected with it, and the Dominion of Christianity[z]:

[y] L'Apocalypse avec une explication. 1689.
[z] Nov. Test. Prolog. in Apoc.

to him succeeded Herder, who, in the detail, has been very happy in some of his observations [a].

But Hugo Grotius, an excellent and acutely discriminating Genius, had long before seen farther than they. He says, at the beginning of the 4th chapter of his explanations of this Book: "pertinent autem hæc visa ad res Judæorum usque ad finem capitis undecimi: inde ad res Romanorum usque ad finem capitis vicesimi; deinde ad statum florentissimum Ecclesiæ Christianæ ad finem usque."

Joh. Simon Herrenschneider [b], Professor at Strasbourg, the author of a small but very comprehensive treatise, has penetrated still more profoundly into the mysteries of the whole. He has shewn, that the two cities, Rome and Jerusalem, whose Fate constitutes the most considerable part of the Apocalypse, are only Symbols of two Religions, whose fall is foretold; but that the third, which appears at the end, viz. the Heavenly Jerusalem, signifies the Kingdom of the Blessed. From these points of view, a celebrated scholar has circumstantially discussed the Apocalypse, whose work is at present the principal book on the subject [c].

SECTION CLXXIX.

THERE are three Cities in this Book, on account of which all these terrible preparations above and here

[a] ΜΑΡΑΝΑΘΑ, the Book concerning the Coming of the Lord, by N. T. Siegel, Riga, 1779, 8vo.

[b] Apocalypsis a cap. iv.—finem illustrandæ tentamen. Argentorati, 1786, 4to. 26 pages.

[c] Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis. Scrips. Jo. Godofr. Eichhorn, 11 vol. 8vo. Götting. 1791.

assures us, xvii. 18., that this Babylon on the Euphrates is Rome on the Tiber [d].

Consequently, Jerusalem and Rome are the two Cities, whose destruction is here seen in the Spirit. These Cities, however, do not exist in reality as cities in the poetical composition, but they are images of other ideas. Rome or Babylon, in particular, is by the author conceived to be opposed to the everlasting Gospel, εὐαγγελιον αἰωνιον, xiv. 6, 7, 8. In this opposition to Christianity, it could hardly signify any thing, but Heathenism, to represent which the capital of the Heathen world is, most eminently and peculiarly qualified. Hence John farther also describes it with such phrases as were used by the Prophets, to denote false Gods and their worship. It is the *habitation of Dæmons*, the seducer to *infidelity* to the true God, to πορνεια, from *the cup of whose fornications* all Nations and Kings of the Earth drink; xviii. 2, 3.; xvii. 1, 2. 5.

If the capital of the Heathen world symbolizes the Religion of the Heathens, we shall easily ascertain, what the capital of the Jews represented. What else but the Jewish Religion? Therefore Heathenism and Judaism, the two prevailing religions of the ancient world, were destined to perish.

And what should now succeed to them? A New Jerusalem, the Kingdom of the Blessed, after this

[d] Rome has, in the Apocalypse, a mystical name, of which one concurring reason may be, that the Mistress of the World had in reality a secret name, the production of which to public knowledge was considered ominous. Plin. H. N. L. iii. c. 5. Solinus, c. 1. Macrob. Saturn. iii. 5. Plutarch, Quæst. Rom. Qu. 61. Servius ad Æn. iii. 295. iv. 598. Georg. i. 498. See the learned treatise of D. Fr. Münter, Selandiæ Episcopi, de occulto urbis Romæ nomine ad loc. Apocal. xvii. 5. Hafniæ, 1811. According to this, Jerusalem must have also received a mystical name.

life, xxi—xxii. 6. This New Jerusalem is certainly so described, and such is usually considered to be its meaning. But if these cities be Religions, they can be no other than these. If Rome and Jerusalem represent Heathenism and Judaism, the New Sion can only be Christianity, which has an endless dominion, and blesses mankind. This the unity of the whole demands; nor would it be consistent, if the idea of it was compounded of such an unequal representation of its parts, as Heathenism, Judaism, and Eternal Blessedness.

For what purpose should this Kingdom of the Blessed afterwards forsake that long beloved abode in the higher spheres, and in Heaven, and descend among men, unless it were an Earthly Institution? xxi. 23. It could only descend upon Earth, as a Religion, for the sake of supplying the place of the two former Religions.

The previous openings of the Graves and the return of the Dead to life can be no impediment to this circumstance. A Resurrection of the Dead is here only one of those awfully terrible images, which the Prophets sometimes used to represent a total change of things, the revival of the national state, and of the religious constitution of the Jews, Ezek. xxxvii. Isaiah xxvi. 19.

And if a last judgment also be connected with it, we well know, that such also is figuratively convoked by the Prophets, for the purpose of executing the punishment of those, who have oppressed and ill-treated the people of God, or for the purpose of expressing Jehovah's designs of introducing a new epoch of glory for his Religion and his People, Joel iii. 2. Zephaniah iii. 8. This being admitted, the whole passage of the seven Seals is only an introduction to the three principal descriptions, to the dis-

solution of Judaism, to the abolition of Heathenism, and the occupation of the Dominion of the world by the doctrines of Jesus, v.—vii. 2. For, a prophecy, according to the ancient prophetical language, is a sealed book, Isaiah xxix. 11., of which the mysteries can only be developed by the Lamb, who is on the Throne of God, the Co-Regent with Jehovah, in whose hands the Events are. Terrible plagues, famine, pestilence, war, and an entire revolution of states are impending, from which those, however, are exempted, who belong to the chosen of the Lamb.

But the Epistles which are preludes to the whole, as far as ch. iv., are Dedications, or Addresses to those Communities, which were particularly connected with the Author, in the district of his Ministry.

Then, the Episode, xii—xiii. which follows the Judicial Punishment of Jerusalem; the episode relating to that noble Woman, who struggles in the agonies of labour, and who is persecuted by the Dragon, (Daniel's ancient metaphor of idolatry,) exhibits to us Judaism, which is still in the act of bringing forth Christianity, as all the circumstances and the individual traits in the description prove. But the other monsters, which ascend from Land and Sea, and which are in the service of the Dragon, signify, according to very recognizable criteria, the Roman Land and Sea-forces, which protect the dominion of Paganism, xiii. 1.—xiv. 6.

Opposed to this, after the Punishment is executed on Rome, xvii. 1.—xviii. another Woman appears on a scarlet beast. The former woman, after her newborn child had been taken up to the Throne of God, henceforth repaired to the deserts and pathless regions, which is an excellent metaphor of wandering Judaism—but the fate of the latter woman is not

prophetical and sacred number, and serves merely the purpose of embellishment and decoration? So likewise the round numbers and times, and half times, neither admit of a chronological nor numerical calculation, but are, for the most part, indeterminate periods and numbers.

There are in the whole but two historical events, which are even thus capable of a historical interpretation. Exclusive of the Dominion of Christianity, with which he closes his visions, the destruction of Jerusalem is one fact; therefore it is to be expected from the Genius of the poet, that he would select for his representation, as far as it was practicable, circumstances founded on fact, instead of those which are poetical and fictitious. In this respect we are also referred to the historical exposition, as far as it may be effected without violence, and as far as history voluntarily offers its assistance.

Parallel to this is the destruction of Rome. It certainly had not taken place, but was admitted by the author for the sake of obtaining a type and an antitype. But notwithstanding this, he saw the then Empress of the nations in a peculiar condition, in which she was at that time only, which supplied him with sufficient facts to describe a State, which was visibly hastening towards its decline and the fall of its greatness. Here also was he obliged, in order to render his picture recognizable and true, to take pains in selecting traits from the actual state of the world; thus his likeness became striking, and passed from the circle of ideal imagery over to that of natural resemblance. But in this, as in the former case, all minutiæ, all that was indistinct or forced, would necessarily be avoided.

SECTION CLXXXI.

VERY evident as it is, from the preceding observations, that this writing has a well digested plan, and an artificial arrangement of its parts; yet even all this is insufficient to give to us an idea of it, unless we peruse it part by part, and examine the connection of each part with the whole; for then only shall we be pleasingly convinced of the beautiful symmetry of its design, and its fine organization.

Of late, some have been inclined, in consequence of its arrangement and structure, to reckon it among the Dramatical compositions. This assertion might be embellished by the circumstance of fragments of a Jewish tragedian named Ezekiel, who must have lived about this time, being extant in Clemens and Eusebius (Παρασκ. Εὐαγ). Or, they might remark, that John wrote more immediately for Ionian and Asiatic cities, in which the Drama had been, for ages past, known and admired. However, all this could only serve to explain the fact, if John had *really* chosen a dramatical form for his composition. But a composition which is merely *narrative* can never belong to the dramatical species, and if it were possible or necessary, that the poetical productions of all countries and nations should always be brought under one class of Aristotle, or distributed according to Greek models, this composition, which is only descriptive, should rather be included under the Epos. Yet, though it be rather deficient in the principal qualities of the Drama, it cannot indeed be denied, that this hypothesis, according to which its

Proposer has analysed the whole, is uncommonly useful for an easier survey, and for assistance to the memory*.

But the language of the Book is less that of John himself, than that of the Prophets, whose embellishments he has borrowed for the sake of exhibiting them, as it were, reunited in one collection. But where he speaks himself, he was forced necessarily to aim at an approximation to their style and diction, as much as it was possible, in order to preserve the uniformity of the Tone. Those, therefore, may be right, who maintain that the Apocalypse does not possess John's style; they must, however, be cautious how they deny to him on that account the composition of the Book, which he intentionally compiled from the images of others, and abundantly endowed with the Beauties of his native Literature after the Oriental custom. Nor must they even be desirous of proving the dissimilarity of style from the comparison of the Apocalypse with the Gospel, or the Epistles; for, the simple historical style, or the language of friendly communication is by no means the *tertium comparationis*, according to which we can decide respecting the author of a poetical Work.

SECTION CLXXXII.

The Book affords to us a solution, in regard to the time in which it was composed, which we are unwilling to pass over without availing ourselves of it. John in the 17th chapter describes a Woman sitting on a scarlet Beast; the Beast has *seven Heads, ten Horns.* This bold allegorical combination is designed figuratively to show to us Rome and its

* Eichhorn Commentar. in Apocalyps. p. xix. xxxiii.

actual condition; we may therefore here
the delineation traits founded on fact, wh
dualize the subject, and designate it as ha
and not merely a poetical existence.

The Woman (he says) is ἡ πολις ἡ μεγαλη
city, ver. 18., and bears the name of *Baby*
The seven heads are *the seven hills*, on
woman sits, ver. 9. These seven hills a
seven kings, και βασιλεῖς ἑπτα εἰσι. But in s
afterwards, he also declares the *ten horns* of
to be *ten kings*, τα δεκα κερατα δεκα βασιλεῖς ε

It is indeed impossible, that Rome, at
should have had *ten*, and yet only *seven*
We shall therefore be obliged, in one o
places, to consider *the kings* not as per
must explain them in a different manner.
will not scruple to do with *the seven hills*,
manners of the *ten horns* are so describe
them we, without any difficulty, recognize t
The seven hills are seven kings, would ther
signify, that they are *royal hills*, upon whi
period, the Dominion of the world rests.
wards he allegorizes with the numbers—five
—one is—one is still to come, and if the eig
the blood-coloured Beast itself, which is has
wards its destruction;—all this merely sign
the Roman Empire has not yet attained it
tent,—that the internal power of the state
less is already upon the decline,—that it
approaching to its last period.

After having spoken of Rome and the
passes over to those, on whom the direct
affairs and strength, and the internal discha
administration devolved. The *ten horns* are
δεκα βασιλεῖς εἰσι, xvii. 12. Now let us se
describes them; they have not received the D

but have usurped it; they themselves hate the woman, the πορνη μεγαλη; they themselves cause her to be abandoned and solitary; they make her naked; they themselves eat her flesh, and burn her. And this woman is THE GREAT CITY, ἡ πολις ἡ μεγαλη, xvii. 16. 18. Can we in this picture mistake the sovereignty of the Cæsars, the manner in which they acquired it, the abuse of the state-power, the Executions and Banishments of the most respectable citizens, the lavishment of the treasures and resources, and finally the late conflagration by Nero?

There consequently existed *ten* Cæsars, up to the time in which he wrote his Book: Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero, Otho, Galba, Vitellius, Vespasian, Titus. This last was the one, under whom he composed his work.

Thus much appears from the author himself; Irenæus offers to us another historical account, which well deserves a short attention to be devoted to it. L. v. adv. Hær. c. 30. In the Latin it is thus: quoniam si oporteret manifeste præsenti tempore præconiari nomen ejus (animalis) per ipsum utique editum fuisset, qui et Apocalypsin viderat, neque enim ante multum temporis *visum est*, sed pene sub nostro sæculo ad finem Domitiani Imperii. An excellent scholar[f] explained this passage, upon the authority of this ancient translation, to refer to the name of the Beast—(nomen visum est,) and thought, that Irenæus had thereby understood Titus Domitianus, because he just before proposes the name Τειταν, which contains the number of the Beast stated by John, namely 666. But if we consult the Greek text, which has fortunately been here preserved, we

[f] Knittel's Contributions to the Criticism of the Revelations, a synodical Essay. Brunswick, 1773.

may translate it *visus est, visa est,* and *visum est*; ἀναφανδον γαρ ἐδει τῳ νῦν καιρῳ κηρυττεσθαι τοὐνομα αὐτου, δι' ἐκεινου ἀν ἐρρεθη τοῦ την Ἀποκαλυψιν ἑωρακοτος· οὐδ γαρ προ πολλοῦ ἑωραθη, ἀλλα σχεδον ἐπι τῆς ἡμετερας γενιας, προς τῳ τελει τῆς Δομιτιανου ἀρχῆς. The word ἑωραθη might therefore mean *visum est nomen, visus est Joannes,* and *visa est Apocalypsis.*

But the first must be the most improbable of these explanations;—*visum est nomen.* In Irenæus the following positions precede our passage: Τειτανις probably the name of the Beast; for it is a royal name, *tale autem est antiquum et fide dignum, et regale, magis autem et* TYRANNICUM NOMEN. Secondly, —but none of the kings had yet borne this name, neque eorum regum, qui secundum nos sunt, aliquis vocatus est *Titan*—thirdly, as notwithstanding the name has good arguments in its favor, still one of the subsequent kings might have borne it, tamen habet verisimilitudinem, ut ex multis colligamus, ne forte *Titan* vocetur qui veniet. According to these assertions the name had not yet occurred in the time of Irenæus, and therefore much less still before him, in Domitian.

As little is the other explanation proposed by Wetstein established, *visus est Joannes.* The Father of the Church, according to this hypothesis, would have intended to say; as yet it is not a long time, since John was seen among us; he was still seen under the reign of Domitian. According to this he would have designed to express the shortness of the time, which intervened between his days and the last days of John. But if this had been his object, his words would have been very inappropriate; for, according to his opinion and statement, John lived much longer, and survived much nearer to the days of Irenæus; i. e. he reached the times of Trajan. See et quæ

est Ephesi Ecclesia à Paulo quidem fundata, Joanne autem permanente usque ad tempora Trajani, testis est verus Apostolorum traditionis, L. iii. adv. H. C. 3. n. 4. He would therefore have been forced to have said: neque enim ante multum temporis visus est, sed sub nostro sæculo, Trajani nimirum imperio.

There is therefore no other choice now left but, *visa est Apocalypsis*—and this according to the statement of this Ecclesiastical Teacher might have been revealed to John during the reign of Domitian; si enim oporteret præconiari nomen ejus, per ipsum utique editum fuisset, qui et Apocalypsin viderat; neque enim ante multum temporis visa est, sed pene sub nostro sæculo, ad finem Domitiani Imperii.

But now the determination of the time, which is taken from the Book itself, would not be consistent with that of Irenæus. John, at the time of writing the Revelations, enumerated ten Cæsars, but the tenth is Titus; and Irenæus names Domitian his Brother and Successor, as THE ONE, under whose reign it was seen; and even arguments, which seem to contradict the author himself, contend in favor of the opinion of the latter.

John (as he says) saw the Apocalypse at Patmos, whither he had gone on account of the testimony of Jesus, i. 9. However, according to the unanimous assertion of ancient History, he was not banished there until the reign of Domitian. The philanthropic reign of Titus, as well as that of his Father, was far from afflicting any body δια την μαρτυριαν Ιησου; but the reign of his very dissimilar Brother is decidedly accused of cruelty to the Christians. The declarations of history and other historical combinations, to which still more could be added, are therefore on the side of Irenæus. How can this be reconciled?

John reckons *ten* Cæsars; how?—has he only

counted the dead?—and was he silent respecti
one then living? This Cæsar oppressed Christi
and had driven John himself from the chair, a
nished him from the bosom of his followers.
honourable mention should or could he make o
And was it in the spirit of his Master, in the s
his doctrines to speak evil of him? And if he
not say any good of him, and might say evil
he any other choice than to be silent resp
him? In this manner I conceive both are harmo
John only reckons the Dead up to this event, and
it to others to name HIM, who was then livin
indeed to the honor of human nature. Irenæu
added the eleventh, for the suppression of
name he had no longer any motive.

SECTION CLXXXIII.

JOHN therefore wrote the Revelations unde
mitian; which is a determination of time pro
to us excellent information respecting the cau
purport of the book. He was himself banis
Patmos on account of his testimony of Jesus,
and it was not perhaps his own personal fate,
pressed heavily upon him; but it was a more g
misfortune, in the participation of which he w
volved, συγκοινωνος ἐν τῃ θλιψει. The Christian
munities in his ministerial district sighed unde
sufferings; the Believers were exposed to p
ments, which the civil power and tribunals exe
upon them. They were thrown into prison
conducted to death, or at least they anticipat
ii. 10, 11.; there was at all events no want of
trious examples of an exalted constancy, whic
already obtained the crown of martyrdom, i

There were also in other places some, who had already succumbed to the trials, and had dishonored their religion, and had not confessed Him, who confesses his faithful followers before his Father and his Angels, iii. 4, 5, 6.

This took place in Proconsular Asia, by means of the Roman judges; such violence did Heathenism exercise against the followers of Jesus! But the Jews (as it appears) had no small share in it, ii. 9., and were, probably in consequence of informations, private or public accusations or instigations, active in rendering the fate of the Christians still more terrible. This was their custom, as Justin Martyr says: like the Romans, *they also* treat us as enemies, consider us as rebels, and murder and ill use us, whenever they can and have the opportunity [g].

Thus was Christianity situated between the followers of both religions, and hated by both; and to its greater misfortune, its internal peace was disturbed by Heretics and its Teachers were in exile.

The situation was terrible; consolation, encouragement were necessary; and whence should they proceed? The time itself offered causes for it. Jerusalem lay in ruins; scarcely had yet the embers lost their glow, which covered the Temple and Holy Place. Thither now John looked to the oppressed, and inspired them with hopes. The judgments were already fulfilled upon Jerusalem; the last convulsions of Judaism alone remained: soon should this religion and the wrath of its Professors no more be an object of terror!

The fact was speaking: the example of God's Judgments over the enemies of his Doctrines was evi-

[g] Apologia Major Rob. Steph. 146. ἀλλ' ἐχθρους ἡμᾶς και πολεμιους ἡγοῦνται, ὁμοιως ὑμῖν ἀναιροῦντες και κολαζοντες ἡμᾶς, ὁποταν δυνανται.

WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

C. AND J. RIVINGTON.

CONTINUED FROM VOLUME I.

XI.

The OLD TESTAMENT, arranged on the Basis of Lightfoot's Chronicle, in HISTORICAL and CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER, in such manner that the Books, Chapters, Psalms, and Prophecies may be read as one connected History, in the Words of the Authorized Translation. With Six Indexes. A New Edition, with Marginal References. 2 vols. 8vo. 2*l.*

By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, M.A.
Prebendary of Durham and Vicar of Northallerton.

XII.

The NEW TESTAMENT, arranged uniformly with the above. The Gospels on the Basis of the Harmonies of Lightfoot, Doddridge, Pilkington, Michaelis—the Account of the Resurrection on the Authorities of West, Townson, and Cranfield. With Copious Notes on many of the principal Subjects in Theology. 2 vols. 8vo. 2*l.*

By THE SAME AUTHOR.

XIII.

An HISTORICAL DEFENCE of the WALDENSES, or Vaudois Inhabitants of the Valleys of Piedmont, by JEAN RODOLPHE PEYRAN, late Pastor of Pomaret, and Moderator of the Waldensian Church. With an Introduction and Appendixes. By the Rev. THOMAS SIMS. 8vo. 15*s.*

XIV.

The HISTORY of the REFORMATION of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, Vols. I. II. III., containing the Reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. 2*l.* 8*s.*

By HENRY SOAMES, M.A.
Rector of Shelley, Essex.

*** The fourth and concluding Volume is in the Press.

XV.

HORÆ PRIVATÆ: or Meditations, Prayers, and Reflections. Second Edition. 12mo. 6*s*.

By the Rev. JOHN STILL, LL.B.
Rector of Fonthill, Gifford, and Cricklade, Wilts; and Prebendary of Sarum.

XVI.

INTRODUCTION to the NEW TESTAMENT. By SIR JOHN DAVID MICHAELIS, late Professor of the University of Gottingen, &c. Translated from the Fourth Edition of the German, and considerably augmented, with Notes. Fourth Edition. 6 vols. 8vo. 3*l*. 3*s*.

By the Rt. Rev. HERBERT MARSH, D.D.
Lord Bishop of Peterborough.

XVII.

A KEY to the OLD TESTAMENT and APOCRYPHA; or, an Account of their several Books, of the Contents and Authors, and of the Times in which they were respectively written. Eighth Edition. 13*s*.

By the Right Rev. ROBERT GRAY, D.D.
Lord Bishop of Bristol.

XVIII.

A KEY to the NEW TESTAMENT, giving an Account of their several Books, their Contents, their Authors, and of the Times, Places and Occasions on which they were respectively written. Eighth Edition. 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*. An Edition in 12mo. 3*s*.

By the Right Rev. THOMAS PERCY, D.D.
Late Lord Bishop of Dromore.

XIX.

ANNOTATIONS on the FOUR GOSPELS and the ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Compiled and abridged for the Use of Students. Sixth Edition. 3 vols. 8vo. *(In the Press.)*

XX.

ANNOTATIONS on the EPISTLES; being a Continuation of the above, and principally designed for the Use of Candidates for Holy Orders. 2 vols. 8vo. Second Edition. 18*s*.

By the Rev. JAMES SLADE, M.A.
Late Fellow and Tutor of Emanuel College, Cambridge; and Vicar of Bolton-le-Moors.